

Contemporary Review

No. 1056
December, 1953

The Problem of Trieste:

I.	RICHARD WIGG
II.	MILAN STOJAKOVICH
III.	ANTONIO GIORDANO
Tibet and India	LT.-COL. CROCKER, D.S.O.
The Australian Scene	REV. DR. COLLOCOTT
Freedom of Speech and Television	PROFESSOR GEORGE CATLIN
Atoms, Hydrogen and Humanity	PROFESSOR J. A. TEEGAN
Sibelius	KEES VAN HOEK
Trade Unions in France	VICTOR COHEN
Robert Browning	DALLAS KENMARE
The General Election in Ulster	FLORENCE O'DONOGHUE
The United Nations and Human Rights	HAROLD F. BING
Price 3/6	Christmas in China	.	.	.	BERNARD LLEWELLYN
45/- per ann.	Foreign Affairs	.	.	.	GEORGE GLASGOW
U.S.A. \$9.50	Literary Supplement	.	.	.	

ALL CLASSES OF INSURANCE TRANSACTED
MOTOR UNION INSURANCE LTD.
COMPANY
10, ST. JAMES'S STREET, LONDON, S.W.1

THE WORLD TODAY

gives the facts about international affairs and the background to them. It is written objectively and without political bias by on-the-spot observers, by experts on the staff of Chatham House, and by other specialists.

Published monthly. 25s. a year.

CHRONOLOGY

summarises political
countries, and
and speeches etc.
(free to post)

SENATE
THE ROYAL
Chatham

ADDIN
TAYLORS THE

WA
PAG

WHERE TO STAY

HOVE, Sussex: Dudley Hotel.—78 rooms, 40 bathrooms. Restaurant open to non-residents. American Bar—Lard's Garage. Hove 3026. Man. Dir.: F. Kung (Swiss).

A charming old-world atmosphere, good cooking and every comfort can be had at the Tudor House Hotel, Tewkesbury (Phone Ilkland, Tewkesbury 3739). Brochure on request.

Please send
a Christmas Gift to the

INDUSTRIAL CO-OPERATIVE RESEARCH

IVY
LIES

those who need it to answer the questions profit-sharing raises in their own businesses, that is the work of the INDUSTRIAL CO-PARTNERSHIP ASSOCIATION, 36 Victoria Street, London, S.W.1.

President—
Sir. The EARL
OF K.G., P.C.

• Royal College of
of England and is
institutions. It is
ries on continuous
es at Mill Hill.

• Our work
• Wright,

AND
RY,
SS AND
XITY
L INCREASE
THE BISHOPS
OPEN
SOUTHCOTT'S
BOX
.ED WRITINGS

BIBLE SAYS ABOUT
AND THE BISHOPS:

temple of God was opened . . . and there was seen . . . the Ark (Chest or Box) of his Testament (or Will)." "And round about the Throne were four-and-twenty . . . Elders (Bishops) sitting (and they) fall down . . . and cast their crowns (their wisdom) before the Throne." Rev.xi.19;iv.4,10.

Write for free leaflets to
THE PANACEA SOCIETY
BEDFORD, ENGLAND

THE WORLD TODAY

gives the facts about international affairs and the background to them. It is written objectively and without political bias by on-the-spot observers, by experts on the staff of Chatham House, and by other specialists.

Published monthly. 25s. a year.

CHRONOLOGY OF INTERNATIONAL EVENTS

summarises political and economic events chronologically and under countries, and contains the full texts or summaries of documents and speeches of international importance. A detailed annual index (free to postal subscribers) makes the *Chronology* invaluable for reference.

Published twice a month. 25s. a year.

SEND POSTCARD FOR FREE SPECIMEN COPIES TO

THE ROYAL INSTITUTE OF INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS
Chatham House, 10 St James's Square, London, S.W.1.

— T Y P E W R I T E R S —
ADDING MACHINES - CALCULATORS
Bought Repaired Sold Hired
TAYLORS THE CALCULATOR SPECIALISTS (Dept. 12), 74, Chancery Lane, London, W.C.2
Tel. HOL. 3793

WHERE TO STAY

HOVE, SUSSEX: Dudley Hotel.—75 rooms, 40 bathrooms. Restaurant open to non-residents—American Bar—Large Garage. Hove 30286. Man. Dir.: P. Kung (Swiss).

A charming old-world atmosphere, good cooking and every comfort can be had at the Tudor House Hotel, Tewkesbury (Phone Bigland, Tewkesbury 3123). Brochure on request.

Please send
a Christmas Gift to the
**IMPERIAL CANCER RESEARCH
FUND**

Patron—
HER MOST GRACIOUS
MAJESTY THE QUEEN

President—
The Rt. Hon. The EARL
of HALIFAX, K.G., P.C.

The Fund was founded in 1902 under the direction of the Royal College of Physicians of London and the Royal College of Surgeons of England and is governed by representatives of many medical and scientific institutions. It is a centre for research and information on Cancer and carries on continuous and systematic investigations in up-to-date laboratories at Mill Hill.

LEGACIES, DONATIONS & SUBSCRIPTIONS

are urgently needed for the maintenance and extension of our work

Gifts should be sent to the Honorary Treasurer, Mr. Dickson Wright,
F.R.C.S., at Royal College of Surgeons, Lincoln's
Inn Fields, London, W.C.2

PROFIT SHARING

greatly enhances the value of joint consultation and provides a sure basis for industrial leadership. It can be done in so many ways that it is well worth while to see how others do it. To describe in detail schemes in practical operation in a wide range of industries, to make this detailed information available to those who need it to answer the questions profit-sharing raises in their own businesses, that is the work of the **INDUSTRIAL CO-PARTNERSHIP ASSOCIATION**, 36 Victoria Street, London, S.W.1.

**CRIME AND
BANDITRY,
DISTRESS AND
PERPLEXITY
WILL INCREASE
UNTIL THE BISHOPS
OPEN
JOANNA SOUTHcott'S
BOX
OF SEALED WRITINGS**

**WHAT THE BIBLE SAYS ABOUT
THE BOX AND THE BISHOPS:**

"And the temple of God was opened . . . and there was seen . . . the Ark (Chest or Box) of his Testament (or Will)." "And round about the Throne were four-and-twenty . . . Elders (Bishops) sitting (and they) fall down . . . and cast their crowns (their wisdom) before the Throne." Rev.xi.19;iv.4,10.

Write for free leaflets to
**THE PANACEA SOCIETY
BEDFORD, ENGLAND**

THE CONTEMPORARY REVIEW, DECEMBER, 1953
CONTENTS

	PAGE
1. BY RICHARD WIGG THE PROBLEM OF TRIESTE— I.	321
2. BY MILAN STOJAKOVICH THE PROBLEM OF TRIESTE— II.	324
3. BY ANTONIO GIORDANO THE PROBLEM OF TRIESTE— III.	327
4. BY LT.-COL. CROCKER, D.S.O. TIBET AND INDIA	330
5. BY REV. DR. COLLOCOTT THE AUSTRALIAN SCENE	332
6. BY PROFESSOR GEORGE CATLIN FREEDOM OF SPEECH AND TELEVISION	337
7. BY PROFESSOR J. A. TEEGAN ATOMS, HYDROGEN AND HUMANITY	343
8. BY KEEK VAN HOEK SIBELIUS	348
9. BY VICTOR COHEN TRADE UNIONS IN FRANCE	352
10. BY DALLAS KENMARE ROBERT BROWNING	355
11. BY FLORENCE O'DONOGHUE THE GENERAL ELECTION IN ULSTER	359
12. BY HAROLD F. BING THE UNITED NATIONS AND HUMAN RIGHTS	363
13. BY BERNARD LLEWELLYN CHRISTMAS IN CHINA	367
14. BY GEORGE GLASGOW FOREIGN AFFAIRS	370
15. LITERARY SUPPLEMENT REVIEW OF BOOKS: ALFRED NOYES; COUNT COUDENHOVE-KALERGI; BOLIVAR; JANE AUSTEN ONCE MORE; ST. ALBANS AND OTHER POEMS; WILLIAM GODWIN AND HIS WORLD; DOCUMENTS ON GERMAN FOREIGN POLICY	376

The SPECIAL ATTENTION of CONTRIBUTORS is drawn to the necessity (in view of the present very high cost of production) of sending in contributions typewritten and in their final form (the number of words being stated) so as to avoid any deletions or additions on the proof.

Sometimes the addition or deletion of a single word involves the resetting of a whole paragraph and thus causes much unnecessary cost and delay.

LONDON:

*Published for THE CONTEMPORARY REVIEW CO. LTD.,
By BRITISH PERIODICALS LTD., 46-47 Chancery Lane, W.C.2*
All rights reserved

THE CONTEMPORARY REVIEW

DECEMBER, 1953

THE PROBLEM OF TRIESTE

I

"WELL, we lost the War didn't we?" Undergraduates dining in the College Hall of a Northern Italian university frequently ended with this remark their conversations around the problem of the Italo-Yugoslav frontier. It is interesting to put this personal experience beside that of recent newspaper reports of blackshirted Italian students marching around Rome singing Fascist songs and shouting insults at Yugoslavia. Interesting because it suggests Italian public opinion is divided just where intransigent unreasonableness was supposedly concentrated. It is precisely this division of the Italian people over the problem of Trieste that worries Allied diplomacy concerned with possible repercussions of an upsetting of Italy's internal stability on the defence of the West. For Trieste could be the national issue which brings to crisis proportions Italy's latent democratic problem taxing beyond their strength those "live and let live" elements at present in control of Italian society. On the one hand the rich and middle classes so preoccupied with patriotic questions and their privileges might once again seek refuge in Fascism, while on the other hand the working classes, too tired by social injustices to worry about those patriotic questions, might accept from the Communists a People's Democracy.

Allied diplomacy to-date has not however had great success in settling the future of this Adriatic port, indeed after the *tour de force* of October 8th the two contesting countries seem to have come nearer to war than they have ever been since 1945. Perhaps at this moment it will be found helpful to go back quietly over the years, re-examining the interaction of Allied diplomacy on Italian internal politics to see if explaining how the present *impasse* came about cannot also offer us some guide for future conduct—conduct that is to say which would go beyond a possible conference and lead to an eventual compromise settlement acceptable to both Italy and Yugoslavia. Italy after the First World War had the same problem of settling her frontiers with Yugoslavia as she has had after this last War. Then flushed by victory she resolved the problem by a use of violence. The social background was, as it is to-day, one of widespread discontent among the common people. The reward for this so hardly won victory was considered to be annexation of Istria and of the chief Dalmatian ports, Italy's share of the estate of the defunct Austro-Hungarian Empire. The 1915 Treaty of London, by which Allied diplomacy had secured Italy's entry into the War, had countenanced annexations of this kind. In peacetime, however, the Allies went back on their too lavish promises and now felt the newly established Yugoslav state deserved

some outlet to the sea. And that could only lead to a conflict of claims over Fiume. Moderate politicians in Italy, notably the Foreign Secretary Count Sforza, attempted a compromise solution with Yugoslavia at Rapallo in 1920 and internationalised Fiume. When however two years later Fascism came to power the port was re-incorporated in Italy and cut off from its hinterland in Yugoslavia.

The prime cause of Mussolini's accession was the social discontent which exacerbated all the patriotic agitation, but undoubtedly a factor contributing powerfully in sympathy for Fascism had been the disillusionment of patriotic aspirations. These aspirations had been at first inflated by Allied diplomacy and then too rapidly deflated, with the result that the "middle of the road" elements in Italian politics were weakened and their compromise solution could not be lasting. One conclusion helpful to Allied diplomacy can surely be drawn from this consideration of the Adriatic problem during the years 1915 to 1924. If the Allies are really concerned with Italian stability their conduct must be calculated so as to reinforce supporters of the existing regime. Further, if the Allies do not intend to make more than slight material sacrifices for such an end, then a promise which suggests anything more lavish is only self-defeating, often dangerously so. After the Second World War Italy was a defeated power and she accordingly lost to Yugoslavia the Dalmatian ports and all of Istria except Trieste. Moderate Italian public opinion has accepted the Adriatic position and the loss of the Colonies as all part of the ruin brought on Italy by Fascism. Such for instance is the meaning to be given to the remark quoted at the beginning of this article. With a mounting sense in the justice of its cause such public opinion has therefore come to concentrate itself on the problem of Trieste. Viewed in the light of the necessity of strengthening the moderate political forces which provide the basis of the liberal Republic set up in 1946 how has Allied diplomacy fared? By 1947 the ideal solution of internationalising the Territory proved impossible—ideal for it would have both given an economic viability to the port and assured the democratic rights of minorities.

To visit Trieste is curiously unilluminating. The Triestini have resigned themselves to having the troubles of their city made a topic for newspapers on the breakfast tables of half Europe, and they seem only to wish to attend to their own affairs, personal or business. Solely the enthusiastically pro-Italian or pro-Yugoslav speak their opinions quickly, the more moderate opinion being much more difficult to assess. Yet one knows it exists; only in May of last year in the Zone A elections 42 per cent of the overwhelmingly Italian population voted against parties advocating a return of Trieste to Italy. And the present local uneasiness shown because Anglo-American troops are supposedly destined to leave Zone A suggests similar underlying feelings. Allied diplomacy has merely followed the Triestini in their sad conclusion that, in a world of sovereign national states, the city is too conspicuous a prize for the wishes of the local inhabitants to be decisive. The United States, Great Britain and France therefore made their Tripartite Declaration of March, 1948. This proposed the return of the *entire* Territory of Trieste to Italy despite the fact that Yugoslav troops had occupied the area called Zone B since the end of hostilities. This Declaration has been fated to replay the role of

the Treaty of London after the First World War. For after Tito's break with the Cominform Allied diplomacy has no longer had the wish—if it ever had the power—to satisfy Italian patriotic aspirations to the maximum. Material has however been provided for the Fascists to try and induce the Italian people to resolve once again by violence this "betrayal" of their national interests. Such arguments provide the exiguous rational basis for demonstrating Roman students. Why the French were moved to promote the 1948 Declaration is well-known, the Declaration's effect on Italian domestic politics perhaps less so. Countenancing what all moderate opinion has come to see as impracticable patriotic aspirations, the Declaration has hindered the efforts of those forces in Italy which might have worked towards a compromise solution of the problem.

Returning after twenty years of exile from Fascism Count Sforza was again Foreign Secretary from 1947 to 1951. During a last long illness which preceded his death he collected together all the principal speeches he had given and all the memoranda he had prepared while in office for a book published posthumously as "Five Years at the Palazzo Chigi: Italian Foreign Policy from 1947 to 1951."^{*} If the value of the book were not locked inside the Italian language it would undoubtedly have got the wide attention it deserves here in England. Coming from such an eminent source the large part of the book devoted to the problem of Trieste could be very helpful at the present time. For Sforza saw clearly that if Italy was in the best position theoretically over Trieste all the practical advantages lay with Yugoslavia. The damage done to efforts for a compromise solution by the 1948 Declaration is clearly revealed. On one occasion for instance, Sforza points out he is forced to be more intransigent over Zone B in order to refute accusations that the Declaration was an intervention by the Allies in an Italian General Election. Meanwhile Sforza himself sketched a more moderate solution to soften the apparently irreconcilable Italo-Yugoslav positions by economic co-operation and to work so that Italian troops replacing Anglo-American troops in Zone A might eventually face Yugoslav forces in Zone B. Then from that parity to negotiate frontier rectifications to attempt to satisfy the ethnic interests of both sides. There is clearly a need to do this with the existing zonal frontiers. For while the Slovenes form a sixth of the total population of Zone A the Italians make a fifth of that of Zone B. In July, 1951 Sforza attempted preliminary soundings.

The lines of a possible solution appeared for a moment as much on the Yugoslav side as on the Italian. Parts of the present Zone A with a Slav population would go to Yugoslavia, while in compensation the Italian zone including the city of Trieste would be pushed south to bring in Capodistria. These talks in Rome failed to come to a positive conclusion, but their significance for Allied diplomacy should not be lost. It seems indeed unlikely that either Italy or Yugoslavia could abandon their present positions to the extent of concluding a compromise by themselves. And that for this reason in neither country is the existing political regime secure enough to withstand the emergence of an opposition armed with the argument that compromise has "betrayed" some vital national interest. But if Allied diplomacy once got clear to itself what were the means to its

**Atlante, Rome 1952* (2,000 lire).

objective and were prepared unflinchingly to use them such an influence to make both sides recognise their interest in a compromise solution might well be decisive. Pressure might be brought to bear to get tied up those loose ends left at Rome two summers ago. Though it may take time to call a conference on such conditions, on any others it would be unreasonable to expect a settlement of the problem of Trieste.

From the foregoing we have an explanation of why the Statement of October 8th failed so signally to "lead to a final solution." Maintaining a studied silence as to the future of Zone B, the dangerous possibility that it meant "all for Italy and nothing for Yugoslavia" was allowed to emerge. Though not responsible for the Statement, the present American Ambassador in Rome, Mrs. Luce, seems to have influenced its formulation considerably, for she is known to believe that Italy's patriotic aspirations must be generously handled if the country is not to go Communist. But, as we have seen, this is only to repeat a past diplomatic error: the cure against slipping to the Left is not to lean heavily over to the Right. The first and most obvious result has been a marked tightening of the Yugoslav position, and the Rome discussions of July, 1951 now seem sadly unreal. Tito's reply to an Italy not brought to renouncing Zone B has been to threaten war if her troops should enter Zone A.

If the main argument sustained by this article is however accepted, the long term guide and condition of success for Allied diplomacy is clear. Only if the Italian government is kept to the compromise solution prospected by Sforza can those "middle of the road" elements be strengthened in Italian society and the Republic continue to be accepted by Italians as "that which divides us least." Such a moderate resolution of the Trieste problem would alone allow for a continued Italian contribution to the defence of the West. To act so as ultimately to concede to Yugoslavia over Zone A would be to repeat just that too rapid deflation of Italian patriotic aspirations that occurred with such tragic consequences after the First World War. Phrases like "appeasement of Yugoslavia," to be heard to-day in the mouths of moderate elements in Italian society, suggest that disillusionment might again play the game of the extremists. And this time it is the Communists who are most likely to win. It is not yet too late for Allied diplomacy effectively to assist Italy's Democratic Centre.

Though now the popular manifestations in Yugoslavia of early October have been paralleled by those in Italy of early November, we can clearly glimpse the grim alternative to a Conference of the five interested Powers: a trial of arms by Italy and Yugoslavia. It is impossible sometimes not to wonder if the chances of a reasonable settlement of the Trieste problem did not die with Sforza; but then, while he was alive, the Tripartite Declaration was fresh in men's minds.

RICHARD WIGG.

II

ALL Yugoslavs—not merely official circles but the entire nation, men and women of all ages and all walks of life—have denounced the decision of the Governments of the United Kingdom and the United States of October 8th, which give Zone A and the City of Trieste to Italy. Zone B of the Free Territory of Trieste is indisputably inhabited

by population predominantly Yugoslav. Likewise, Zone A itself is almost one hundred per cent. Yugoslav populated. Furthermore, the Yugoslav areas reach not only as far as the present frontiers between Italy and Yugoslavia (or, rather the present frontier between Italy and Zone A) but even over these frontiers. In fact the real ethnic boundary between the two countries lies along the Soca River, beyond the present Eastern frontier of Italy. Parts of Yugoslav national territory—Trieste itself, Gorica Province, Istria, the city of Zadar, the island of Lastovo and several others—had been given to Italy by the Treaty of Rapallo after the First World War as a reward for the services she rendered by stabbing in the back her former friends and allies. From that time right until September, 1943 when Italy capitulated and abandoned her ally, Hitler's Germany, these Yugoslav areas remained under Italian rule.

Even though Italian nationals in Trieste itself are today more numerous than the Yugoslavs, the city is nothing but a small island within a compact Yugoslav sea of population. But even in Trieste itself there are today more than 40,000 Yugoslavs. Hapsburg Emperors had allotted to Trieste the role of a Central-European port. Even a glance at the map shows that it offers the best natural outlet to the sea to all states of its hinterland. As such the city developed successfully until it was given to Italy. In 1914, that is to say before the city was surrendered to Italy, the merchant shipping totalled some 720,000 registered tons. But in 1940 the tonnage had fallen to 520,000 tons. The twenty years of Italian rule brought, therefore, a net loss of some 200,000 tons. Even at the time of her own domination, Italy never participated to any considerable extent in Trieste's railway traffic. What would happen now if the city were to be given to Italy again? There is no doubt that it would inevitably suffer another serious decline. This danger is well appreciated even by the Triestini of Italian origin who are among the most ardent advocates of the internationalisation of their city.

The early XXth century saw the emergence of clearly defined drives of Italian expansion. The first drive aimed at domination of the Adriatic and the Balkans. Let us quote some opinions expressed by Italian sources concerning Italy's efforts to dominate *the Adriatic and the Balkans*.

Signor Mario Alberti, the ideological champion of Italian irredentism in Trieste (in his publication *Trieste e la sua Fisiologia Economica*, published by the "Association of Italian Industrialists," Rome, 1915) wrote: "Trieste is a very important factor for the solution of the Adriatic problem. But Trieste is only one such factor. Side by side with Trieste we must have several other factors, should we wish to complete a lasting and successful effort: Istria, Fiume and Dalmatia, side by side with Trieste are but links in one and the same chain The problem has to be solved integrally or not at all There could be no two masters of the Adriatic"

There is no need to recall either the scope of or the ghastly methods employed in carrying out Mussolini's ambitions in this part of the world. Let us, therefore, turn to present "democratic" Italy. Ever since 1947 an institution has been hard at work in Rome, known under the name of the "Centro studii Adriatici," enjoying financial and moral support from the Government of Italy. The leadership of this institution includes

Members of Parliament, Generals, Admirals, University Professors, etc. No doubt, one of the most distinguished members of this "Centro" is Signor Guido Gonella, until recently the Secretary General of the Government's own Christian Democratic Party and a member of the Italian Cabinet. The "Centro" publishes its own bi-monthly *Bollettino d'Informazioni*. In this bulletin one reads frequently statements like this: "There are people who do not take into consideration the fact that the problem of Trieste does not stand isolated, but, on the contrary, that there exists the problem of the Adriatic itself within which the problem of Trieste is but a detail." (No. 82, p. 104, 1952.) Therefore, since Trieste is "but a detail," Italy could not be satisfied by receiving Trieste alone, since the wider problem, the problem of the Adriatic itself, would still remain unsolved.

A solution of the problem of Trieste in favour of Italy is considered by the expansionist circles of Italy to be but the first step back into the Balkans, and to offer an opportunity to inflict upon Yugoslavia a heavy foreign policy defeat with the aim at weakening as much as possible her international position. This in turn, according to their plans, would be the first step towards restoring the former dominant position of Italy in this part of Europe. These tendencies also show why Italy so stubbornly opposes an understanding between the Balkan peoples in their efforts to join forces against aggression. Italy wants the Balkans to be disunited and broken up so that she can dominate them. Obviously, the expansionists from Italy feel now that she has no sufficient forces to carry out alone any of these plans. That is why the attempts are being made to enlist the support of the Western Government and the entire Atlantic Pact in a policy hostile to Yugoslavia. These same Italian circles through a policy of blackmail and open threats are trying to alter the role of Italy as a member of the Atlantic Pact. According to them, Italy is not a member of that Pact in order to help to build international security, but to make use of the Atlantic Pact in her own expansionistic policy.

With the decision of the Governments of Great Britain and the United States, announced on October 8th, to hand to Italy Zone A, the problem of Trieste and Italo-Yugoslav relations have reached a deadlock. Italian appetites have been stimulated further. Italy has received yet another award light-heartedly given. Yugoslavia, on the other hand, has been presented with a *fait accompli*, which both by its form and substance inflicted a heavy blow to Yugoslav interests. That is why Yugoslavia can never reconcile herself to it. Yugoslav national rights and territory are endangered in Zone A. The taking over of the civilian and military administration of Zone A by Italy would be an open breach of the Peace Treaty and an act of violence and aggression. Should Italy decide to take such a step, the Yugoslavs would consider it to be within their lawful rights in taking adequate measures to protect their interests. Naturally, the entry of Italian troops into Zone A under the protection of the Atlantic Pact forces would not be a lesser act of aggression than if they were to enter without that protection.

A solution by a simple application of the Peace Treaty in the present situation would not help to strengthen peace in this area. The recent suggestion made by Signor Pella to hold a plebiscite was made with the

aim of acquiring Yugoslav territories by the use of the Italian vote concentrated in the city of Trieste itself. Yugoslavia has made several suggestions in order to find an agreed solution. At the present time perhaps the best solution would be to have the city of Trieste internationalised, with Zone B and the rest of Zone A—both these areas being overwhelmingly Yugoslav populated—joining Yugoslavia. Yet another proposal was made by Yugoslavia after the October 8th decision. It shows that Yugoslavia is prepared to make even the greatest sacrifices to reach an agreement. President Tito suggested that the city might be placed under the sovereignty of Italy as an autonomous city, while the rest of Zone A and Zone B, again as an autonomous unit, might be placed under the sovereignty of Yugoslavia. *Here, no doubt, is a basis wide enough to begin negotiations.* It is still not too late to avoid the far-reaching consequences of the decision of October 8th. However, now is the time to decide whether to continue to yield to blackmail and threats of the Italian expansionists and thus jeopardise peace and security in this part of the world, or to persuade Italy that she cannot go any further along her present lines of policy without endangering peace and security in the world.

M. STOJAKOVIC.

III

THE Trieste problem represents an undoubted danger to the peace of Europe, and its settlement is hindered not so much by the difficulty to bring Italy and Yugoslavia together as by the fact that the Western countries have failed to understand the true substance of the question itself. Disputes in the Adriatic between Italians and Slavs are as old as the beginning of this century when Austria, in order to fight Italian expansion in the zone of Trieste, mobilised the Slavs of the former Dual Monarchy and, in order to fight Italian expansion in the zone of Fiume, mobilised the Hungarians. Government officials, police staff, customs inspectors, railway officials, etc., of Slav origin have been encouraged to immigrate from Slovenia, Croatia, etc., into the Trieste district while those of Hungarian origin replaced the officials of Italian origin in the Fiume district. Until 1912-1913 the police in these towns was in the hands of the local authorities, while on the eve of the first world war the police powers were transferred to the State and trains full of Slav and Hungarian policemen arrived in the Adriatic regions of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy. If, therefore, any doubt should be raised as to the present feelings of the population living in the Free Trieste Territory it is evident that things should be investigated not only as far back as the 1918-1919 period but as far as 1900 when the former Austro-Hungarian Monarchy started her denationalisation action in the Adriatic.

It is in view of the undoubted rights which Italy has on these territories from the nationality point of view that Premier Pella has suggested the settlement of the Trieste question through a plebiscite both in Trieste as well as in Zone A and Zone B. This suggestion has been rejected by the Belgrade Government in defiance of the principle of freedom of the people to establish its own destiny according to its nationality. The fact that the Western countries have not drawn the attention of Yugoslavia to the

anachronism represented by the alleged democratic feelings of Marshal Tito and his refusal to follow democratic principles by a plebiscite is a good argument for the Fascist and Nationalist propaganda in Italy to claim that freedom is a mere dream and that what counts is power. Just as Hitler's attitude in Munich induced Great Britain and France to accept the occupation of the Sudeten region of Czechoslovakia, now the Western countries refuse to get Marshal Tito to accept democratic principles. This is the most dangerous aspect of the situation, as in 1919 the Fascist agitation started in Italy exactly after the refusal of President Wilson to meet the Italian demand for a plebiscite in Fiume and the consequent D'Annunzio enterprise which compelled the Allies to withdraw their forces from the Gulf of the Quarnero, thus abandoning democratic and liberal principles. The uncertainty of the Western countries in regard to the necessity of getting Marshal Tito to follow democratic and liberal principles, namely the organisation of a plebiscite in the Free Trieste Territory, works only in favour of the creation of a black or of a red dictatorship in Italy, because there are many Italian democrats who claim that Mussolini alone succeeded in 1926 in reaching a direct agreement with the Belgrade Government on Fiume.

Independently, therefore, of the dangers which the Italo-Yugoslav quarrel might have in regard to the international situation, delaying its settlement through a plebiscite, after the restoration of a situation of parity between Italy and Yugoslavia, who administers already Zone B, involves considerable dangers for the democratic regime in Italy. If Italy has suggested that the Free Trieste Territory question be settled through a plebiscite, this is the best confirmation of the fact that she has no fear in regard to the recognition of her political rights on the territory itself. On the other hand, the Italian political control on the territory involves no danger for the economic requirements of the countries of the hinterland. In 1913 goods unloaded in the port of Trieste reached 2,314,018 tons and goods loaded 1,135,712 tons, making a total of 3,449,730 tons. This figure has been regained in 1938 with a total traffic of 3,380,866 tons realised through the development of the iron and steel industry, oil refining, and seed-crushing plants in the territory of Trieste itself and through a policy of cooperation with Austria, Czechoslovakia and Hungary. In 1938 Czechoslovakia occupied the first place in the imports into Trieste by rail with 252,821 tons, Austria the second place with 160,150 tons, Hungary the third place with 99,439 tons, and Yugoslavia the fourth place with 59,058 tons, while in the exports by rail during 1938 Austria occupied the first place with 502,252 tons, Czechoslovakia the second place with 144,523 tons, Germany the third place with 55,213 tons, Yugoslavia the fourth place with 51,748 tons, and Hungary the fifth place with 49,637 tons. In the postwar years Austria has greatly increased her traffic through Trieste, reaching during 1952 a total of 506,180 tons in the imports and 1,519,663 tons in the exports by rail, despite the fact that direct railway connections between Trieste and Vienna via Graz are hindered by the Yugoslav railway tariff policy, and that the greatest part of the trade must be handled by the single rail line from Trieste to Udine, Tarvisio and Willach. Even Germany has increased her transit trade through Trieste in the post-war years, but Yugoslavia, despite the inter-

national regime of the port, has shown her outward transit trade declining from 51,748 tons in 1938 to 17,981 tons in 1952, while in the inward Yugoslav transit trade there has been only an increase from 59,067 tons in 1938 to 70,446 tons in 1952, which is quite comprehensible since Yugoslavia must look upon her own ports such as Fiume as the Dalmatian maritime centres. If Czechoslovak and Hungarian transit trade has not developed through Trieste in the post-war period this is simply the result of the facilities granted in Poland and in Roumania to transit trade from Czechoslovakia and from Hungary. Thus there is no necessity to internationalise the port of Trieste in order to safeguard the interests of the Central European countries.

If Trieste industries have been able to work practically at full since 1945, this has been because Italian shipowners have ordered in Trieste huge ships such as the motor liners "Augustus" and "Giulio Cesare" of 27,500 gross tons each, and three or four supertankers of 32,000 tons in addition to smaller ships, because the Aquila oil refinery has been able to sell about 60 per cent. of its output on the Italian home market, and because the Ilva iron and steel works at Servola secured orders from the same market. There are also important interests which the Trieste insurance companies have been able to develop in Italy.

These circumstances clearly show that Trieste is not connected with Italy only by historical and national ties but also by deep economic interests which could not be ignored without affecting not only the life of the Adriatic city itself but also the progress of the Central European transit trade through the Adriatic. Austria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary and even Yugoslavia are guaranteed regular sailings from Adriatic ports thanks to the subventions of the Italian Government to leading Italian lines as the Lloyd Triestino, the Adriatica Società di Navigazione a Vapore, etc. The freedom of shipping in the Gulf of Trieste is vital for the future of the great Adriatic port. From this point of view it is evident that through the control of the coast of Zone B Yugoslavia could affect such freedom. Nobody could prevent the Belgrade Government from connecting the Bay of Pirano or the Bay of Capodistria in Zone B with the Erpelle railway station, thus developing a competitive activity against Trieste, just as it has occurred in Fiume when the eastern section of that port (Porto Baross) was given to Yugoslavia in 1919. Sooner or later Yugoslavia and Italy must find a basis for agreement, but this will not be realised until the question will be considered exclusively from the political point of view. By delaying an understanding through the refusal to accept the plebiscite proposal made by Premier Pella for the Trieste Free Territory Marshal Tito hinders the development of the export trade from Yugoslavia, which sold in Italy about 50 per cent. of her exports between 1926 and 1938, and favours the competition of the North Sea, Baltic and Black Sea ports in the Central European countries, which in view of the political tension in the Adriatic, instead of using Trieste or Fiume for their trade, might grant preference to the competitors of these two ports.

ANTONIO GIORDANO.

Genoa.

TIBET AND INDIA

THE menace of the occupation of Tibet by the Chinese is fully realised by the Indian Government which has taken energetic steps to guard the two thousand miles frontier. Frontier posts have been reinforced and villagers are being trained in the use of firearms. Military missions have been sent to Nepal for the purpose of organizing and training Nepalese forces. Exports of many articles to Tibet have been stopped and a check has been imposed on Chinese using the new roadway from Lhasa to India. In November 1950 Pundit Nehru stated at Delhi that he would tolerate no crossing of the McMahon Line which constitutes the boundary between India and Outer Tibet. This line was agreed to at the Simla Conference in 1914 by the representatives of England, Tibet and China but was afterwards repudiated by the Pekinese Government. The frontier between India and Tibet is formed by the independent States of Bhutan, Nepal and Sikkim with the exception of about 250 miles on the northern border of Uttar Pradesh, formerly known as the United Provinces. The Nepalese Government have long since recognised the danger that threatens them from the Communist occupation of Tibet and it is possible that the "liberation" of Nepal will be undertaken before long. The formation of a "Nepalese Council for Democracy", financed by Russia, lends support to this belief. The "Council" consists mainly of deserters and disgruntled officials with a following of ruffians who are merely out for loot.

The Chinese occupied Tibet with an army of some 10,000 men in addition to strong guards posted at the passes leading out of the country through the hills. They serve the double purpose of protecting the country and preventing the escape of Tibetans who have been fleeing in large numbers with their treasures, especially after the Communist decree confiscating privately owned gold, silver, and jewelry. The army of occupation is now reported to have been increased to about 25,000 men and has absorbed the Tibetan army except for 500 men who act as guard of honour for the Delai Lama. Tibetan officers are allowed to retain their swords and to receive the same rate of pay as the Chinese officers of equal rank. The Chinese grip on the country has been firmly established. Air fields have been built and others are under construction which allow of a regular air service with China. Existing roads and tracks have been improved and new roads laid out between Tibet and China, as well as from Lhasa westwards to Kashmir and south and east to the border States which will be able to carry heavy military traffic.

Pundit Nehru's foreign policy has ever been towards the establishment of friendly relations with Pekin, but his efforts in this direction seem to have fallen on stony ground. Despite the protests of the Indian Government to China prior to the invasion of Tibet and the assurance that any such occupation would be effected by peaceful means, the occupation of Tibet was only carried out by the Chinese after considerable fighting. The faith of Pundit Nehru in the Communist Government at Pekin must have been rudely shaken. Nobody was naive enough to believe the explanation put forward by Pekin that the occupation of Tibet by the Chinese was essential to forestall "imperialist manoeuvres." The trust

of India in the good faith of Communist China has received a bitter disillusionment, and Indian politicians are beginning to realise that Pekin is not taking them seriously. The occupation of Tibet by the Chinese must inevitably influence the strategic situation of India to a degree that can scarcely be reassuring to the Indian Government. Besides the command of the air over the Eastern Provinces of India, the Communists have gained complete control over the Himalayan Ranges and so over India itself. The Tibetan plateau, 12,000 feet above sea level, affords an ideal site for rocket projection as well as planes. Protected as it is by the encircling ranges, Tibet is practically impregnable against attack from India while at the same time the possession of the frontier permits the Chinese to launch attacks on India and Kashmir at will.

It must be borne in mind that when Tibet was threatened with attack and sought assistance from India, Pandit Nehru not only refused any help but on the grounds of strict neutrality stated that no military assistance of any description would be allowed to go to Tibet through India. From a political point of view an invasion of India by the Chinese from Tibet would present a problem of serious complexity. India is still within the Commonwealth of Nations and as such is entitled to protection and assistance from the rest of the Empire as well as from N.A.T.O. This would mean that British and allied troops would have to fight in India against the Communists, which would merely amount to a continuation of the struggle in Korea on a smaller scale in which it is doubtful whether America would render any assistance beyond the supply of equipment. Were India attacked from Tibet, the attitude of Pakistan would be problematical. Would she come to the assistance of India or would she remain aloof? Pakistan would be threatened as well as India, either directly or through Kashmir, and her efforts to assist India would thus be neutralised.

India is threatened with Communist political infiltration no less than by direct military action. Hordes of Communist agents are infiltrating into the country from Tibet and are spreading Communist propaganda throughout the country. They are in close touch with the strong Communist Party in Hyderabad and in the Congress itself where they form the only recognisable opposition to the Government. Communism is gaining a strong hold on the University students and the *Intelligentsia* of India who can find no outlet for their activities in government employ. Communist literature is sold openly at Lahore and Peshawar and many of the newspapers are openly Left inclined. Early in 1950 Moscow issued direct orders to its agents for an intensification of Communist aggression in south-east Asia. A meeting of hand-picked trade union leaders from different countries was summoned at Pekin where verbal orders were issued for the Soviet campaign in which emphasis was laid on the preparation of steps to be taken in conjunction with China as a base for further successes in India, Pakistan and other countries. Sjelvankar, the Indian representative, was admonished because mass uprisings in India had not been used correctly by the Communists and was given further instructions aimed at the disruption of the social and economic life of India. Recently the Governments of India and Burma have discovered a plot by the Communists in Tibet to send monks to the Buddhist shrines

as spies and agitators from among a certain sect known as "Ch'oundokys" who have always given their support to the Chinese Communists and acted as a fifth column during the occupation of Tibet.

The rosy view taken by the Chinese representative in Lhasa on the second anniversary of the "liberation" of Tibet by the Chinese is to some extent discounted by more recent reports of deep resentment by the Tibetans against the siezure of their traditionally monastic country by China. There have been anti-Chinese riots in Lhasa and attempts to assassinate the Quisling Sawang Ngabou. Gun-running from both India and Pakistan has assumed serious proportions, and on both frontiers a sharp lookout is being maintained for Communist political agents who were largely responsible for anti-Indian demonstrations at Khatmandu after the return of the Everest team. Tibetan refugees who have arrived at Kalimpong near Darjeeling have reported that food in Tibet is scarce; and in some districts where food is being distributed there is practically a famine and the economic situation is getting worse partly owing to the requisitions to feed the hordes of Chinese soldiers who are living on the country. Refugees confirm reports that these troops now number about 25,000 men. The price of food has quadrupled within the last two years. Great discontent is caused by the forcible removal of many of the Lamas from their lamasaria to work on "development" schemes. At the same time the Chinese have undoubtedly done a great deal of good in the way of medical care of the people. Hospitals have been established and a medical team is touring out of the way districts. Further developments in this direction may depend on and coincide with Communist operations in Indo-China on the conclusion of the monsoon rains where renewed activity by the Communist Viet Minh forces is confidently expected by the French. Finally, the entire scheme of Communist operations in south-east Asia may and probably does depend largely on events in Korea.

LIEUT.-COLONEL H. E. CROCKER.

THE AUSTRALIAN SCENE

WITH six State and one Federal parliament to throw in and out Australian citizens soon become experienced voters. An occasional Referendum—almost invariably recording a "No" majority, whatever the issue—provides opportunity, not altogether wasted, to enlarge political education. This year a general election in Victoria has ended a long, and latterly uneasy, term of office of the conservative parties, distracted by bickerings between their Liberal and Country Party components, by putting the Labour party into power. South Australia has retained its conservative government, but with lessened electoral support. In all States excepting South Australia Labour governments are in office. That does not mean that the States are girding themselves for tasks of radical innovation. Indeed, it is often difficult to see what difference it makes whether Labour or non-Labour is in office. Australian Labour parties are problem children. On their left are socialists. On their right are people who presumably accept the socialist policy which is, more or less, a Labour aim, but whose allegiance to socialism is much weaker than

their desire to prove that they are anti-Communists, and to do nothing to lose the Roman Catholic vote. About a quarter of the population of Australia is Roman Catholic, and the Church, which is conservative, shows tactical wisdom in leaving the conservative parties to carry on the good work without aid which they do not need, while it concentrates on widening its influence in the trade unions and labour parties, which, without the Church's support, might be expected to be leftist. Labour leaders have a ticklish job in holding together their right and left wings. Before the last Federal general election, about two years ago, the leader of the Federal parliamentary Labour party, Dr. Evatt, who is an eminent barrister, conducted two cases for the Communist party before the High Court, and added to his offence by winning them. The opportunity was too good to be lost, and Dr. Evatt, despite his prestige in the United Nations Organisation and in Australian political and legal life, was hard pressed to retain his seat. He maintained that the ethics of his profession demand that a barrister should take a brief and do his best for anybody, and that law and justice do not depend on political or economic opinions. Last year in Britain Sir Hartley Shawcross upheld the same principle, when he was assailed for appearing for what were described as near-fascist organisations. It is to be hoped that that tradition is secure in our practice of law and justice.

Of wider interest than State elections were the Federal Senate elections held in May. The Senate has sixty members, ten from each State, half of whom retire every three years. The Senate was elected, after a double dissolution, in May, 1951. As a year is counted from the July 1st preceding an election, half the Senate retired this year. Nominally the Senate's function is to care for the interests of the States. The State is the electorate. Actually the Senate has the same party complexion as the House of Representatives. When the government has a majority in the Senate it is an unnecessary house of swift transit for government legislation. If the Senate has an opposition majority it exercises a function which is described, on the one hand, as hampering and frustrating the government in carrying out the tasks which it was elected by the people to do, and, on the other hand, as providing a breathing space for wise and statesmanlike second thoughts on ill-considered proposals. During the electioneering campaign the Senate came in for hard knocks as redundant, effete or obstructive. Suggestions that it be abolished tailed off into vague agreement that it needs to be reformed. Nevertheless, both parties tried hard to secure a majority, not only for present use, but even more to provide easy transit, or wise and statesmanlike second thoughts, for the bills of whatever party happens to be in office after next year's elections to the House of Representatives. In the event both Labour and the Liberal-Country party coalition profess satisfaction at the result of the Senate election—the Labour party because the voting showed a considerable swing in their favour, and the government parties because their electoral losses were less than seemed likely a couple of months earlier, and they retained a narrow Senate majority.

Economic trends are, on the whole, encouraging. The rapid depletion of sterling has been reversed, and substantial reserves—they were never low—have been accumulated. Drastic restriction of imports is a most

unsatisfactory feature in obtaining this result. The *Sydney Morning Herald* writes, "Continued steady improvement in Australia's overseas trading results is making the import restrictions imposed last year seem more and more an unnecessary and hampering survival." At the same time the paper points out the uncertainties of Australia's position in world markets, flowing from high and rising costs. Income from wool will be about £400,000,000, and there are significant rises in other export items. Larger shipments of meat to Britain are gratifying to Australian graziers and to British consumers. Further expansion is likely. Good results are being obtained from skilful cattle breeding and attention to the improvement of pastures. Better pastures raise carrying capacity and the quality of animals. Sheep and cattle grown for food provide better meat when their own food is good and abundant. Wool-bearing capacity and the quality of the wool are significantly related to the types of pasture on which sheep are grazed. In New South Wales the combined effects of careful sheep-breeding and pasture improvement are shown in the rise of an average of 4.75 lb. of wool per sheep in 1876 to 9.57 lb. in 1951. Last season's clip is expected to work out at an average of 10.75 lb., the highest figure yet reached. Forty years hence, it seems, sheep will be induced to carry a fleece weighing 12.8 lb., but, on present showing, will not go much beyond that. Russian wool buyers made a welcome and stimulating reappearance at this year's wool sales. The more business men get together to do business the better are the prospects of mutual understanding and of the personal relations which will mitigate political acerbities.

It is expected that there will be an excellent wheat harvest this year, but so far there is uncertainty about what to do with the crop when we get it. The present stabilisation scheme expires in November, and the Wheat Board and the farmers have not yet made up their minds about what comes next. Australians, like other people, want to eat their cake and, if possible, have something over. In other words, how can wheat farmers get the benefit of high world prices without adding to the cost of living at home? Poultry farmers are as concerned at the cost of feed for their stock as housewives at the price of bread, bacon and eggs. It is estimated that a rise of 1s. per bushel in the price of wheat adds 2½d. a dozen to the price of eggs, ½d. to the cost of a 2 lb. loaf, and ¼d. a lb. to the cost of bacon. The housewife's point of view, with its hint of buyer resistance, is doubtless reflected in the comment of Mrs. Waight, Federal secretary of the Australian Primary Producers' Union, "Eggs are now 6/- a dozen and bacon is 5s. 6d. a pound. That's as far as Australians will go." Production, however, is buoyant and expanding. Mr. McEwen, Minister for Commerce and Agriculture, has reported that rural production in 1952-53 was estimated to be about 15 per cent. above that of the preceding twelve months, and 19 per cent. above the average of the three years immediately preceding the war. Further expansion is expected next year. The dilemma of high production costs and selling prices that deter purchasers is, of course, not peculiar to Australia nor is it likely to be solved by exhortations to work harder and use better methods. A price structure which, in the last resort, depends upon preparing for and waging war cannot any longer be tolerated, nor can the artificial and

hampering division of the world into East and West. Stable and expanding economies must be based on peaceful construction, in a world whose trade flows freely to every part. Sound morality is sound economics. The Rev. Alan Walker, spokesman for the "Message to the Nation" of the Methodist church has been declaring to overflowing audiences in some of the largest halls in Australia the urgent need to resolve the East-West tension. Australia has a direct and overriding interest in the cultivation of friendly relations with Eastern Asia, to which geographically she belongs. Yet the chair of Oriental Studies in the University of Sydney, which was so ably filled by Professor Sadler, is at present vacant, its attenuated remains being a weekly lecture by Mr. C. P. Fitzgerald, Reader in Oriental History at the National University in Canberra.

In a land of three million square miles, inhabited by nine million people, transport and communications present difficulties and impose burdens unknown to more populous countries. A frequently noted handicap to the swift working of Australian railways is the man-made one of different railroad gauges in different states. But there is fine achievement. Australians, it seems, support a greater mileage of railways per head than any other people in the world. Fast and comfortable trains run between the main cities and towns. Melbourne and Sydney have good electrified city services. Great loads are hauled long distances by powerful modern locomotives. There are as well thousands of miles of excellent roads. First class ships carry passengers and cargo round the coast. Air lines criss-cross the continent in every direction. But there is almost no limit to what may usefully be done. More ships are needed on the coast. Congestion in the port of Sydney slows down the handling of cargo. Melbourne harbour authorities are using revenue on long-range plans of improvement and developments, but work is retarded by inflation and rising costs. Today a million pounds accomplishes less than it once did. Whyalla in South Australia and Port Kembla in New South Wales owe much of their industrial and shipping importance to Broken Hill Proprietary Limited, the great steel company, as does also Newcastle, a main centre of Australian heavy industry. Work is in hand to turn Cockburn Sound, near Fremantle in Western Australia, into a big commercial harbour, with cement production as its first industrial support. Queensland and Western Australia are the two largest states, very sparsely populated, though their populations are growing fairly quickly. Both states have climates ranging from mild temperate to tropical, in which anything may be grown. Queensland is the leading cattle-producing state, and, with northern New South Wales, supplies the Australian market with sugar, pineapples, bananas, tobacco and other tropical and sub-tropical fruits. Valuable deposits of iron ore at Yampi Sound in the north-west are being worked; pearl fishing has long been carried on in northern waters. The Northern Territory, for a long time almost neglected, is recovering, and will surpass its old importance as a breeder of cattle. Hopeful experiments are being made in rice-growing, hitherto confined to the Murrumbidgee Irrigation Area, in southern New South Wales. Simple comparisons underline the basic importance of large-scale swift transport. From Sydney to Perth is about as far as from London to Leningrad; from Brisbane to Melbourne as far as London to

Madrid; and the distance across the country from south-east to north-west equals that from London to Cairo.

Not only men and goods but water also needs transport. From the lovely island of Tasmania in the south to Northern Queensland stretches a vast belt, of varied and magnificent beauty, whose rain-fall varies from high to very heavy. Other coastal areas might be cited, but this is the best known and most populous. Short rivers, swollen by rains, rush tumultuously to the sea, or flood the farms in the rich alluvial plains. Valuable lands on slopes and lowlands are eroded; precious water is wasted. It is certain that the vision of the late Dr. Bradfield, builder of Sydney Harbour bridge, and of the well-known writer Ion Idriess, of immense volumes of water, turned back from their headlong course to the sea to penetrate the mountains and feed interior rivers, will be realised. Work now in hand will divert water from the Snowy river, in the south-east mountains, into the Murrumbidgee, enlarging and controlling the flow of that important river, and adding to the sources of hydro-electric power. The Hume Reservoir, opened about twenty years ago, forms a lake two and a half times the size of Sydney Harbour, in the upper stretches of the Murray. Its benefits are felt as far as the grape-growing lands of South Australia, a thousand miles away. Hydro-electric power will be generated at the dam. The face of north-west Victoria and south-west New South Wales has been transformed by irrigation. Some projects have been started where work is too slow, or temporarily suspended. Such lapses are too readily shrugged off with the remark, "We have taken on too much at once."

Uranium deposits open up the prospect that, unless, as one scientist remarks, all the ore is sold to the United States, atomic energy will, within comparatively few years, become the most important source of power in Australia. Youths of scientific bent are encouraged to undertake advanced studies in physics by hysterical and uncivilised legislation which makes knowledge of nuclear research so dangerous to its possessor that the conservative *Sydney Morning Herald* is provoked to comment that the only safe course for the owner of such knowledge is to fall on his head and suffer a loss of memory.

Water and trees go together. Australians have been slow to value the majestic and diverse beauty of their forests, the plumage and song of their birds, the curious interest of their native animals, just as they have failed to appreciate the amazing bushcraft, the bold and vivid art, the fascinating ritual and lore of their aboriginal predecessors in this land. Awareness grows as the means for its satisfaction diminish. More people are preserving or planting native trees about their homes. Large state forests aim at providing commercial soft-woods, and not at restoring the native bush. Happily a slight increase is reported of the total native population. There is awakening consciousness of the inhumanity with which the aborigines have been treated, and that opportunities for a good life must be given them, with gradual assimilation into the general stream of Australian life. Meanwhile aboriginal artists and singers become successful exponents of Western art forms, and native children hold their own with white children in schools. Attention given to aboriginal art and music is rather the scientific curiosity of anthropologists than popular

interest. This ancient, gifted and patient people have much to give to Australian life, not least perhaps the sense of roots cast deep in an ancient land and culture.

New South Wales.

E. E. V. COLLOCOTT.

FREEDOM OF SPEECH AND TELEVISION

IN a recent speech, in Manchester, Mr. Randolph Churchill said, of the London *Times*: "charging their readers 4d. and printing larger newspapers than anybody else, ready, as they have shown themselves on many occasions, to act as the conscience of Fleet Street as well as of other larger and more important institutions, they set the lead in the glorious cause of suppression." With Mr. Churchill's demand that his attack on Lord Rothermere, and also on the pornography mongers, should be reported *in extenso* I am not here concerned. The implications, however, of the principle of the Freedom of the Press, neither to suppress nor be suppressed, deserve less conventional treatment than they usually receive. There is a great deal of bogus connected with it.

It is well to remember that Freedom of Speech was one of those Four Freedoms under the banner of which, as well as under that of national survival, we are supposed to have fought the Second World War. With Freedom of Speech for historical reasons Freedom of the Press, as a major organ for the expression of public opinion, is usually associated. But the pulpit, theatre, films, radio and television are also organs; and their impact upon the public mind is, on the average, almost certainly more influential. Television is, as the Archbishop of York has said, "a most powerful organ of thought and opinion." It would be poor compensation to maintain freedom of the press while denying it in all other fields. Should we chance to regard Freedom of Speech, even at heavy administrative costs, as quite vital to a liberal democracy, then we shall have to enquire very gravely just what this involves—and expect to pay those heavy costs.

Freedom of Speech from the point of view of the administrator and technocrat is almost always untidy and usually inefficient. For them the virtues are efficiency for the authorised ends of public policy, loyalty and knowing when to keep quiet. The inquisitive reporter and snooping journalist are almost invariably a nuisance and in bad taste. Compared with all this a despotism is tidy. However, as John Stuart Mill states, in his classical essay *On Liberty*, the worst of all despotisms, because the most subtle, is the benevolent despotism. Mr. Randolph Churchill suggests that Sir William Haley, at the *Times*, exercises such a despotism and the right to suppress what is news. Lord Simon of Wythenshawe alleges precisely such a dictatorship by Sir William Haley and also by his predecessor, Lord Reith, at the British Broadcasting Corporation.

The major difference is that the B.B.C. is a monopoly, by law and Lord Baldwin established, and the *Times*, perhaps fortunately, is not. If the *Times* does not like one's views one can go to the *Daily Telegraph*, or the *Manchester Guardian* or the *Daily Worker*. There is also some reason to suppose that, if the *Times* does not like one's philosophy, this will provide

excellent ground why the *News Chronicle* will; and conversely. But, on the other hand, the B.B.C. moves with a massive impartiality in the twilight zone between the party limelights and, if Mr. Jones or Smith, Boggs or Binns or gentlemen with other agricultural names do not like one's voice for reasons unassigned, or have the view that one can contribute nothing they would like contributed, that is the end of the matter so far as the United Kingdom is concerned. This voice will then only be heard, if at all, on Radio Luxemburg or on the American Armed Forces Programme. The rest is silence. The monopoly within the United Kingdom is total.

The present writer is well aware that there are excellent and most respectable reasons for this point of view. Let us look at it as touching the press. There are tabloids, both daily and monthly in this country, which offer material compared with which the American press has no equivalent. Some of the contents, in the case of the monthlies, would probably be banned by the police from the American bookstalls. A once-a-week journal is not unknown in Britain which, after a brief period during which its chairman sought to introduce responsible political and economic articles, reverted to a simple formula for successful circulation by stress upon sex and crime. The chairman and editor resigned, but the circulation rose by two million. It is not necessary to look here for the corrupting effect of advertisers. The enquiry of a recent Royal Commission does not, on the whole, sustain this charge. The source of corruption is the public taste itself. We can, therefore, understand the self-righteousness of *Pravda* which, reviewing the corrupt follies of a free press, exhorts us to "be cultural."

Pravda has a case. But, broadly, the decision of the free world is to remain free; to permit rivalry and more competition than exists between *Pravda* and *Izvestia*; and to pay the undoubted costs (for costs there are) of this policy, even in that lucrative sensationalism to which the editor of the *Daily Mirror* genially admits. There is a great deal of bunkum in the argument for Freedom of the Press, since not everybody, but only a few very wealthy organisations (such as the Co-operative Party and Trades Union Congress) or very wealthy men, mostly peers, can subsidise or sustain a national newspaper and bring it before the public. And few editors hesitate to exercise the prerogative to "play up" or "play down" the news—what is "news" is not automatic—and the freedom to print or to suppress. There is a lot to be said for a monopoly governmental press, with lofty standards, sustaining law, order and respectability. But not enough . . .

The whole issue turns on the right of people to be wrong. Since, however, nobody in morals has a right to be certainly wrong and if "error has no rights," we should rather speak of the right of people to experiment about what is right and to learn for themselves about taste by exercising their own judgment. We may have scepticism about whether "Government knows best." Trust in the judgment of the common freeman (about which he had yet very shrewd doubts) Aristotle made the very touchstone of democracy. Without going so far in scepticism and individualism as to affirm that "there is no disputing about tastes" (because there is), we may entertain a doubt whether any Government department,

or any public corporation or self-selected body of mentors, is entitled to tell us what finally is good for us in taste, values, morals or politics. Matthew Arnold praised Cardinal de Richelieu for preparing to set up a French Academy which should be a recognised master in terms of tone and taste. We may take advisers—but we will make our own choice about who these advisers shall be. This principle today occupies a central position in the controversy about the future of the monopoly B.B.C., broadcasting and television. In the United States there is no such monopoly, the Federal Government limiting its intervention to technical matters of wave-length distribution. Nor does it exist in Canada where, under a not unsuccessful system, the national broadcasting corporation is in competition with private companies.

It is true that the applications of this principle, like all exercises of freedom, have to be subject to restrictions in the interest of a good public order. And here, of course, the rub comes. In the United Kingdom, although not in the United States, there is a mild censorship of the theatre, seldom (matters affecting the royal family apart) exercised politically but rather against "gags" of more than a nautical shade of blueness. In the United States there is a voluntary censorship accepted by the film industry under threat of worse. Hence the principle of "no censorship," despite the *Areopagitica*, only obtains in the book industry as an idiosyncracy and not as a sacred principle of general application. Nor can we sharply distinguish the fields. That grave and serious matters of morals are only affected by what people read in books and newspapers, and not by what they see in the theatres, films, and television, is nonsense. But to accept a censorship against obscenity and the like is one thing and to admit a monopoly mentorship of good taste is quite another. It can be—I do not say that it need be—controversial, inquisitorial and pernicious. I do not say that the basic principles of democracy, including trust in the judgement of the common man, are beyond controversy. They are not: dictatorship by the politically or educationally conscious vanguard or by some kind of scientific, aesthetic or other clerisy, has a case. But I do say that a monopoly mentorship is dead contrary to those principles of democracy.

It was, at first, proposed that any private broadcasting corporation in Britain shall not be permitted to broadcast or televise on religion or politics. Except as a merely temporary precaution I do not know why. As to politics it seems to be highly undemocratic, except as a provisional exclusion for technical reasons. So soon as wavelengths become available I know no reason, if there is solid ground to fear partiality, why the T.U.C. and Co-operative Societies should not own their own stations. Exclusion cuts out from the field some of the most eminently desirable public commentators. I can see, of course, that permission can be inconvenient to the discipline and vested interests of party machines. Perhaps the private corporation might invite in unrepresentative or unofficial or unpopular politicians (I mean with the party central offices). But then the B.B.C. has already had to confront complaints of this same kind, when it found the more official back benchers to be dull as broadcasters and chose others. The question here is whether a democracy, given time, can detect a demagogue, given rope. Maybe not; but I like to hope so.

As touching religion the Bishop of Oxford utters a weighty protest against any exclusion; and it is interesting to notice how, in free competition, a religious broadcaster such as Bishop Fulton Sheen has built up an immense public to hear his presentations of Christian faith and apologetics. On the other hand, within the last year, a pacifist speaker could be heard and seen in the States, on radio and video, who could not be heard in Britain.

There are two major arguments, from the point of view of those concerned for the first of the Four Freedoms, against monopoly national television and broadcasting, one negative and the other positive. Negatively, it is dangerous by what it has arbitrary power to exclude. Positively, it is dangerous because of what it may arrogate to itself the power to inculcate. "It is not what they want," said the Lord Protector, "it's what's good for them—that is the question." This is a view that has been heard throughout the ages. Among the two or three humorous Latin inscriptions in London (one being over Admiralty Arch) not the least eminent is that in Broadcasting House which, by the slightest of misconstructions, seems to identify Lord Reith with God Almighty. It is not for nothing that Lord Simon of Wythenshawe, in *The B.B.C. from Within*, animadverts to the dictatorial powers of two of the Directors-General. Lord Reith referred, as "a fundamental," to "the brute force of monopoly" and modestly added, in *Into the Wind*, that "I have always functioned best when responsibility and decisions rested solely with me." Referring rather to Sir William Haley's direction, Lord Simon comments: "I fear that complacency is a real danger to the B.B.C." In the entertainment world, but assuredly not only there, if the B.B.C. does not like anyone the appeal is not to the consumer, the public. There is no appeal and there is nowhere else, in the world "on the air," to which to look.

It is, moreover, a fact that societies nationally famous, when selecting their speakers, con through the lists of those who have spoken on the B.B.C. It is, therefore, no exaggeration to say that, indirectly but actually, the B.B.C. has a patronage with the sovereign public exceeding in power the royal patronage of the Eighteenth Century. It is a dangerous power, much too great, to make or mar, for any small group of men to have. It has been said that, thirty years hence, no one will succeed in politics who has not got a private radio station at his command. It might be said that, disastrous although this could be, it would be yet more disastrous if he had to have a national monopoly station as his patron.

On the positive side, I have been impressed by a remark made to me by a member of the Beveridge Commission on Broadcasting. "If the public is given a chance between bad taste and good taste, of course it prefers bad taste." This is what may be described as the "superior intelligentsia" attitude, peculiarly British and the new form of class rule. I am not for the moment arguing whether the view is true. It is not the American or Canadian view, but these may be quite wrong. The B.B.C. is probably not as beset with the results of a little group of mutual admirers being in charge, who find each other amusing, as have been certain other British public corporations at certain well-known epochs in their career. Nevertheless the danger is real. And I am unable to make any philo-

sophical distinction between issues of educated taste (except that the criteria here may be less certain) and issues of educated values. Shall the public then have their values decided for them, by choice of persons or themes, and perhaps expounded in the well-known style of a *Times* editorial? If I had to entrust my conscience to (or have it informed by) a traditional church or the staff of the B.B.C. I know which I would choose. It would be better than the latter to have the ghostly presences of the Founding Fathers, as in America, as the counsellors of our social conscience. There seems to me to be an element of impertinence in a small group, whether self-selected or Government appointed, deciding what is good taste for me—not as a sound point of view, but as a monopoly, apart from my own free choice of faith. Against this I am protestant.

I suggest that this whole argument has to be taken very seriously indeed. I am well aware that liberty may belong only to virtue and that moral service may be "perfect freedom," the true slavery being bondage to vice. The question is: who settles what is moral service and what is vice? Should we choose to accept the democratic philosophy, then I submit that it follows that the public must have the right to experiment in what is right, even if wrong; to be crude and clumsy; to learn by its errors; to grow. We have time. Or have we? Admittedly Mr. Gladstone, while saying ("at Chester") that the principle of the Tory Party is "distrust of the people qualified by fear," added that "the principle of the Liberal Party is trust in the people qualified by prudence." Liberalism, from the days of James Mill, believed that "the middle class, which gives to science, to art, and to legislation itself their most distinguished ornaments, the chief source of all that has exalted and refined human nature, is that portion of the community of which . . . the opinion would ultimately prevail." Perhaps these views may have swayed Lady Violet Bonham Carter and others.

The problem here goes to the very basis of education and of the question "who is to decide who should educate whom in what." Is it to be the Marxist clergy or the Catholic clergy or Archbishop Fisher—or is it to be Sir William Haley (to whose credit, as Lord Simon says, it should be put that he left school at fifteen) of the B.B.C. and *Times*, a man of firm character? These are indeed problems, not local, but of the civilisation of the Twentieth Century and (as Plato said it would be) of democracy itself and its opinions.

The technical problems of private corporations in broadcasting are, as the newly published White Paper makes clear, not as prohibitive as have been alleged. The original reason for establishing, under a Conservative Administration, a national monopoly system sustained financially through the Post Office may have been, in part, an obvious analogy with other Post Office activities for what was, in Savoy Hill days, a very precarious undertaking and, in part, considerations of national security. Incidentally (and as against an argument used by Mrs. Stocks), it is worthwhile to point out that the Postmaster-General is not entitled to open our mail and to decide which of it would be for our good to have delivered, even if he is the obvious person to deliver it. Some feel that a general programme of nationalisation, in affairs of iron and coal and banking and "some other such low concerns," commits them to a particular point of

view in the higher contracts of the things of the mind. The only contract here is with truth. The present writer has been a life-long adherent of the Labour Party, because he believed that its policy was more likely to conduce to a concrete and substantial liberty for the weekly wage earner, without discrimination of race, than lay in the tendencies of a party among whose elected representatives a manual worker was still a rarity. It may be that he was mistaken; and this is merely inserted as an auto-biographical comment. But, assuredly, the issues of nationalisation in matters affecting staple industries, national monopolies, fiscal decisions touching the pockets of all, which *debent ab omnibus approbari*, are something fundamentally different, as different as they well can be, from all proposals for a spiritual monopoly, based on police power and not choice.

To many advertising is a scandal. I shall not discuss discreet B.B.C. advertising or even mention whether Mr. Gillie Potter's alliterative charge was right about "boosting bawdy books." The B.B.C. is indeed very discreet and, like any efficient benevolent despotism, highly tolerant in whatever does not matter. But I fail to see why those who are not scandalised by the consideration that the *Times* and *Observer* and *Manchester Guardian*, so far as they do not run at a loss, run on the basis of advertisements related to circulation, as well as of subscriptions, yet are horrified by the thought of Reckitt's Blue or Mr. Gollancz being advertised on the air with the propriety which we might expect. Or is it Johnny Walker who terrifies?

The decision is that the advertisers will no more control policy or contents than they do in the *Observer*. They will not be sponsors able to pick and dictate the views and news. They will be sold space in time. The sensitive public will doubtless get used to ignoring advertisements on the air as in the press. Others like them. It may, however be said that we have here a captive audience, the presumption being that the customer who has paid all of fourpence for a copy of the *Times* is not captive. Nevertheless the member of this audience is free to decapitate his captor by the turn of the knob, and to return to the B.B.C. programme which, as a monopoly, is oddly enough not supposed to have a captive audience. It is not even the case, hitherto, that the regional programmes of the B.B.C. are in genuine competition as touching the decentralised supply of speakers and artists. The tyranny is total.

I have discussed the very real issues here at stake. I do not wish to appear to overlook the equally real difficulties. It was Bernard Shaw (scarcely a democrat in good standing) who said that "all culture is imposed from above." Those who have a deep aristocratic distrust of the good judgment of the common man, who is thought of as the inevitable dupe of demagogues in politics and of charlatans in art, have their case. It is even formidable and I should be the last to deny that, if we decide against culture as imposed by the secular arm, the little man being taken by the scruff of the neck and elevated to higher things by a kick in the pants of his lower nature, we are taking great risks. Some think them worthwhile. I am indeed sure that everything will be done, in this great country, with a fair linen decency and decorum, and not without benefit of lawn sleeves. This is one recognised route in Britain of progress and

liberation. I praise it. I am no disrespector of Areopagites. But I am solidly sure that if we have more Areopagi than one, a spiritual garden blooming with many Bloomsburies, we shall be very much safer. The great socialised corporations, incidentally, will have the money to advertise. The Conservative Party will now have to consider what small private enterprise shall do, singly or co-operatively, to persuade us, for example, to drink milk.

Music, as Plato said, decides politics. He was serious and he was right. Is the prospect with competitive television merely one of tango and rhumba, bebop and jive? Who said that there should not be a strict censorship against "sex" and sadism—which might later be applied to the press too, in curtailment of its over-ripe and fruity liberties? I am not against stern checks being put upon some who would be ahead of the rest in giving the public what it wants. Forty million Englishmen can be wrong from ignorance, political or artistic. But some trust in the natural good in human beings, as well as awareness of their original sin, is necessary if democracy is to survive. And it is surely an interesting and relevant consideration that, during the war, when the authorities found they had opera singers in the ranks, they offered them to the troops to sing popular numbers. But it was "the ranks" who set up a popular demand that opera singers should sing opera. Maybe the rankers were B.B.C. trained. Maybe, however, it was they who demanded this better training.

Maybe that just as a B.B.C. manner gave Lord Baldwin great advantages, and radio enabled Mr. Roosevelt to toast marshmallows with the home folks before the national fireside, so competitive television will sweep Mr. Aneurin Bevan into power. And maybe not. At least if a mistake is made there will always be those who are ready to return by legislation to the national monopoly, perhaps once again under some future *Times* editor. At least it seems to be a responsible thing to suggest that we could take a chance with freedom, and with seeing how and what the millions wish to sing. That chance I would take.

GEORGE CATLIN.

ATOMS, HYDROGEN AND HUMANITY

ALL material things are composed of one or more of some 90 elements. Each element consists ultimately of minute particles called atoms, so incredibly small that counting at the rate of one atom per second it would take over a million years to estimate the number in a piece of matter about the size of a marble. Since August 6th, 1945, when the news was broadcast to the world that the Japanese city of Hiroshima had been devastated by an atomic bomb, we have passed into the atomic age, and the time has come when everyone should have some idea as to what an atom might look like, if we could see it, and of how energy can be obtained from it. Each element has its own distinctive type of atom, and when elements combine to form compounds the ultimate particles of the latter, called molecules, contain whole numbers of the atoms of the elements concerned. It is possible, therefore, to estimate the relative weights of atoms from an analysis of the compounds in which they occur, and it is

now usual to express the atomic weight of the elements relative to the weight of the oxygen atom, to which an atomic weight of 16 is assigned. On this scale the atomic weight of hydrogen, the lightest element, is 1.008, of helium, the next element, 4.003, and of Uranium, the heaviest element, 238.07. In the 19th century atoms, as their name implies, were regarded as indivisible, but this view could no longer be maintained after 1898, when J. J. Thompson, at Cambridge, showed that minute particles, now called electrons, were emitted by the atoms of any gas when an electric discharge was passed through it. An electron is a minute charge of negative electricity with a weight two thousand times smaller than that of a hydrogen atom. Atoms are, however, uncharged, so that if they contain negative charges they must contain an equal number of positive charges to neutralise them.

Following some years of research at Manchester University, Rutherford finally showed that the positive charges in an atom are situated on a nucleus at its centre, and that the electrons rotate about the nucleus in much the same way as the planets about the sun. His experiments indicated that atoms, far from being solid, are highly porous structures, the empty spaces in an atom being proportionately as large as those in the solar system. On Rutherford's theory, hydrogen, the lightest atom, consists of a nucleus, of weight almost the same as that of the atom itself, with a single planetary electron rotating around it. The hydrogen nucleus is now called a proton, and it carries a positive charge of the same size as the negative charge of the electron; this charge is called the unit charge. In 1919 Rutherford showed that protons could be knocked out of the nuclei of other atoms, and in 1930 Chadwick found that neutrons could also be obtained from atomic nuclei. A neutron has about the same weight as a proton from which it differs only in the fact that it is uncharged. It is now believed that, with the exception of hydrogen, the nuclei of all atoms are built up out of protons and neutrons which, together with the electrons, are the fundamental units out of which matter of all types is composed. The number of protons in a nucleus determines the nuclear charge, and, starting from hydrogen with nuclear charge one, this increases by one unit as we proceed from element to element up to uranium, the 92nd element, for which the charge is 92. In any atom the number of planetary electrons is numerically equal to the nuclear charge. The total number of protons and neutrons determines the atomic weight. Helium, the second element, for example, has an atomic weight of about 4 and a nuclear charge 2. It consists, therefore, of 2 protons and 2 neutrons. J. J. Thomson, and later F. W. Aston, developed at Cambridge an electromagnetic method of weighing atoms to an accuracy of about one part in ten thousand. They found that most chemical elements are composed of two or more types of atoms, each differing in weight but having the same nuclear charge. Atoms of the same element which have the same properties but different weights are now called isotopes. Since the chemical identity of an atom is determined solely by its nuclear charge, it follows that isotopes of given elements contain the same number of protons but different number of neutrons in their nuclei.

Now to the problem of energy from atoms. In the theory of relativity proposed by Einstein, he showed that energy of all kinds possessed weight

of its own. Thus if a body gains energy its weight increases by an amount determined by the energy acquired, or if it loses energy there is a corresponding loss in weight. A body possesses more energy when in motion than it does at rest, but the corresponding increase in its weight is very small. The energy that a man puts into a life-time of manual labour would weigh little more than a few specks of dust. Einstein derived this relation between mass (weight) and energy; if one gramme of matter were converted into energy the total energy set free would suffice to maintain a 4,000 horse power engine for over ten years. Evidence for the liberation of energy in this way was first obtained in 1932 by Cockcroft and Walton. They designed a giant machine at the Cavendish Laboratory in Cambridge for producing half a million volts, in which protons could be accelerated to enormously high speeds. On allowing them to fall on a thin target made of the metal lithium, a proton occasionally collided directly with and became embedded in the nucleus of a lithium atom. A lithium nucleus contains 4 neutrons and 3 protons, which with the embedded proton forms an unstable structure that immediately breaks up into a pair of helium nuclei each containing 2 protons and 2 neutrons. These fly off in opposite directions with enormous energy. The total weight of the helium nuclei is slightly less than that of the proton and lithium nucleus from which they are formed, and Cockcroft and Walton found that the weight loss corresponded exactly to the total energy liberated. This was the first time that atomic energy was liberated in the laboratory, and the total energy emission was exceedingly small, since collisions between protons and lithium nuclei were very rare. In other elements the energy release was found to be equivalent to the mass loss, and it became clear that nuclear matter is the fuel from which atomic energy is derived. Later atomic transformations were effected by bombarding the elements with neutrons. Neutrons are very powerful weapons for attacking nuclei as, owing to their lack of electric charge, they are not repelled by the positive charge of the nuclei. It was shown in 1939 that the uranium nucleus, after absorbing a neutron, splits into two almost equal fragments with explosive violence due to an unusually large mass loss. Moreover, under certain conditions this fission process appeared to be cumulative, since in addition to the main fragments more neutrons are liberated which initiate a chain reaction by carrying on the process to the surrounding uranium nuclei.

There are five isotopes of uranium of weights 238, 235, and 234. Of these uranium 235 is fissionable even by very slow neutrons, and it is only in this isotope that an explosive chain reaction is possible. It occurs only to the extent of about 1 per cent in ordinary uranium, so that for use in the atomic bomb this isotope had to be separated from ordinary uranium, this being the main technical difficulty which had to be overcome in producing the first atom bomb. The possibility of a chain reaction in uranium 238 is ruled out by the fact that its nucleus is fissionable only by neutrons of high energy. It can, however, combine with the neutrons emitted by the fission of uranium 235. When this happens it forms a new element of atomic weight 239 and of nuclear charge 93; it is called neptunium. This new element is, however, unstable and quickly becomes transformed into another element, plutonium with a nuclear charge 94.

and an atomic weight 239. Like uranium 235 this element is of importance because it is fissionable by neutrons of any energy. In the bomb dropped on Hiroshima, uranium 235 was used. In the second bomb at Nagasaki, plutonium was used. And what is the hydrogen bomb? The fact that the sun consists of a massive globe of hydrogen suggested that its energy might be derived either from the annihilation of its hydrogen, or its conversion into some other element. It is now thought that the energy is produced by the conversion of hydrogen into helium.

One way in which this may happen is the so called "Carbon Cycle" in which a carbon atom undergoes a series of nuclear rearrangements in the course of which it collects 4 protons. Two of these protons change into a pair of neutrons and finally unite with the two unchanged protons to form a helium nucleus. There is a weight loss in this process and energy is liberated; this energy is heat and light some of which reached the earth. The nuclear reactions constituting the "Carbon Cycle" arise from the speed and frequency of the collisions between atoms at the high temperature (of the order of 20 to 40 millions of degrees), prevailing in the central regions of the sun, so that the formation of helium from hydrogen is essentially a thermo-nuclear reaction. In producing energy in this way the sun loses about 4 million tons of its weight per second, but despite this it has enough fuel to maintain its present energy output for another 50,000 million years.

The synthesis of helium is the central idea behind all projects for producing a hydrogen bomb. One suggestion is to simulate the Cockcroft and Walton experiment on a large scale by causing the atoms of hydrogen and lithium to produce helium at a temperature of the order of some millions of degrees, produced by the explosion of some fissile uranium as a detonator. Another suggestion, probably the one which has been tried out in America, is to synthesise helium by the combination of ordinary hydrogen and its rarer isotope tritium under high temperature conditions.

In producing helium from hydrogen alone it has been calculated that 180,000 kilowatt hours of energy would be released from every gramme of hydrogen transmuted. The equivalent calculation for the fission of one gramme of uranium (235) gives an energy release of only 20,000 kilowatt hours. The relative power of the hydrogen bomb would, however, be increased by the fact that the fusion process would be much more efficient than the fission process, also by the fact that there is no limit to the size of a hydrogen bomb, whereas the uranium bomb cannot be increased in size beyond a certain critical amount. It is claimed for this reason that a hydrogen bomb could be as much as a hundred times more powerful than a uranium bomb.

In view of the international struggle for supremacy in the design and use of atomic weapons of war, it is hardly surprising to find that even among responsible people there are many who regard the release of nuclear energy as an unfortunate discovery. Actually such a view cannot be justified since it is already clear that the use of this source of energy for peaceful purposes offers almost unlimited possibilities. First and foremost is the contribution which the release of nuclear energy is likely to make to the world's power supply. Although still in the experimental stage, atomic piles, in which energy is being generated under controlled con-

ditions, are now being operated both in Great Britain and in the U.S.A. In these piles a large quantity of heat is produced, and this can be carried away by the flow of a suitably driven liquid or gas through the uranium, and caused to generate superheated steam to drive engines, etc. Most of the outstanding technical difficulties are associated with finding suitable materials for use in this transfer of the heat from the pile. They have to stand up both to high temperatures and to the extremely powerful radiations emitted within the pile; also they must not absorb neutrons to any appreciable extent. Assuming that such difficulties have been overcome, as they will be, it would seem that the most useful application of nuclear energy will be in the industrialisation of large mobile units. In America an atomic power submarine is at present under construction. This, it is claimed, will revolutionise naval strategy and tactics, for atomic powered submarines will be able to travel under water without surfacing at regular intervals for refuelling. Atomic powered aeroplanes are also now in the experimental stage.

Ultimately the large scale application of nuclear power is dependent upon the availability of nuclear fuel. One pound of fissionable uranium is equivalent in energy output to 15,000 tons of coal or 8,000 barrels of oil, and it is reckoned that the present "proved" supplies of uranium 235 could supply the world with power for about six months, which could be extended to 50 years if all the available uranium 238 could be converted into fissile plutonium. The use of Thorium for conversion into uranium 235 would further extend this period. Since November 1951 a large block of offices has been heated by atomic power at Harwell, and the Atomic Energy Commission Depot at Idaho now produces all its own electricity from their atomic pile. Undoubtedly the great problem in connection with power production on a large scale is the enormous capital outlay involved. It is estimated that £1,000 M. would be required for the plant needed to provide 50 per cent. of the present electrical consumption in England. Once in operation, however, the generation of electrical energy from atomic piles could compete economically with the conventional coal burning methods.

Of more importance so far have been the advances in medicine, science and various branches of industry arising from the use of radio isotopes produced in atomic piles. Already radio-active forms of almost all the elements have been obtained in this way. Those of longer life like Cobalt 60, a powerful gamma ray emitter, are being used with great success as a substitute for radium to which they are, in some respects, superior and are far cheaper. Radio cobalt has a half life of 5.3 years, which means that within this time it loses half its gamma ray activity. At Cambridge 2 radio-iridium bombs, with a gamma ray emission equivalent to 20 grams of radium, are in constant use. Radio iridium has a half life of 70 days: one of the bombs is kept at Harwell for re-activation whilst the other is being used. Radio isotopes of short life, of which a great many are now available, have the added advantage that they can be introduced by injection into parts of the body inaccessible to radium. Further, the dose can be controlled automatically by using radio isotopes of known lifetime, and in many cases small doses of the isotopes delivered in this way migrate selectively to that particular part of the body upon which they

are required to act, since special tissues automatically absorb certain elements. Use is made in surgery of the fact that radio sodium, injected into the bloodstream, is carried to every part of the body and so, by the use of a Geiger counter, the circulation in any particular region of the body can be checked. Tracer techniques can also be applied to studies of the absorption by certain foods and drugs within the body. Recently, heavy nitrogen produced in America has been used with great success for investigating gout.

In industry radio isotopes are being used in many fields. In, for example, the production of synthetic textiles like nylon and rayon, electrification by friction in the weaving machine causes the collection of dust. With a little radio isotope near by the charges leak away through the air, thus dust accumulation is prevented. The use of tracer techniques in chemistry for following the course of chemical reactions is obvious, and the employment of tracer elements has already added extensively to our knowledge of various processes in agriculture, such as the absorption of certain elements by plants and the efficiency of fertilisers, whilst the study of plant diseases is being developed along similar lines to those employed in medicine. The advent of atomic energy gives promise of spectacular advances in the near future, and the development of its many applications must ultimately bring great material benefits to mankind. The realisation of this promise is, however, not solely in the hands of the scientist; it is fundamentally a political problem dependent upon our ability to ensure by international co-operation that this greatest of all scientific achievements shall never again be used for purposes of destruction in war.

J. A. TEEGAN.

Victoria University, Egypt.

SIBELIUS

JEAN SIBELIUS is not only the greatest living composer, but the greatest Symphonic composer since Beethoven. Renewing the symphonic form by striking fresh paths and opening new vistas, he achieved for music in this century what Beethoven did for his time. His work scales the entire gamut of musical creation, from the light lilt of his "Valse Triste" to the sombre Fourth Symphony, descending to depths of Hades never plumbed in music before. An old Finnish saying holds that "music is born of sorrow" and the vast horizons of Finland are tinged with melancholy. One has to be a Finn to experience the full meaning of his famous tone poem "Finlandia", or to feel fortified by the dark terror of "Tapiola." All the world, however, feels the radiance of his Symphonies and hails the classic simplicity and serenity of that culmination of his genius, the Seventh.

His music has a universal appeal, yet it is essentially Finnish, nurtured by Finnish mythology and poetry, shaped and moulded by the Finnish landscape. The greatest interpreter of the spirit of his people and of the beauty of his country, his name has become as symbolic for Finland as Chopin is for Poland. His are not the lilting streams of Beethoven's Pastoral, as they have nothing of the fragrance of an English summer which

pervades Delius. Sibelius' music has the primaevial strength, the myriad sounds and colour and textures of the eternal struggle with elementary force of a land of granite locked in ice during long dark winters, an awe-inspiring solitude matched by his spacious phrasing. One has to know Finland to realise how the music of Sibelius rings everywhere in Finnish ears. The serene oboe melody of the Scherzo in his Second Symphony hangs over those island-dotted lakes, and the lake waters madly race over the Imatra Rapids with the resounding fortissimo of the last movement in that Symphony. The sea and the wind crashing over the granite boulders on the coast and inland seas found their reverberation in the adagio of the first movement of the Fourth which is so evocative in its entirety of the solitary mood of endless snow-carpeted forests of silver birches.

When his people's struggle for independence reached the height of foreign oppression, Sibelius expressed in his Symphonic Poem "Finlandia" a protest which it was then forbidden to voice in words. One can easily understand how the composer could not be divorced from his country. He refused to leave it in the Civil War when Communist sentries prowled outside his room "like beasts." He refused all offers to be evacuated during the recent war. "I must live in Finland. If I ever abandoned my own country, it would finish me and mean death to my art."

"Ainola," the home which he built himself over half a century ago, is a compact villa set on a knoll in a pine grove overlooking Lake Tunsula, an hour's train journey from Helsinki. It looks sturdy with its deep red tiles, the log and timber walls, set on stone foundations. Early this century the hamlet was an artists' colony. It changed after the Russian invasion when thousands of refugees from Soviet-annexed Karelia were settled here, and made Jarvenpaa a miniature boom town, emergency dwellings dotting patchwork acres. "No," said Sibelius when I asked him, "I could not bring myself to move. One loves one's home because of the joys as well as the sorrows which one has lived in it. I couldn't just uproot all that." We sat in his library on the ground floor, the end of a suite of rooms of which the sophisticated salon leads into a peasant art dining room, the dining room into his study. Above the Steinway Grand hangs a laurel wreath from the late Marshal Mannerheim. Sibelius filled a homespun-covered easy chair, lighting a vintage cigar, steadying with his left fist his badly shaking right hand.

He is a very big man, but not oppressively so, since his build is well proportioned. His well cut suit gave him plenty of room as did his collar a few sizes too large for the turtle-leather neck. And what a head! I had seen it hewn in marble by Aaltonen; now I faced it as cast by nature in all its strength—the very embodiment of the Finnish national epic, the *Kalevala*. He is as bald as a billiard ball, his skin the colour of ivory. His high forehead is deeply furrowed, a mass of wrinkles when in thought; I counted between the eyebrows six deep vertical furrows. His large, piercing ice-blue eyes are ageing with a tinge of grey. His ears are beautifully shaped; the sensitive mouth is tightly drawn above the controlled energy of the jutting jaw. He looks in appearance every inch the titan of the man he is in his music. For all his embodiment of Finland, Sibelius is hardly a pure-blooded Finn. A genealogical table of about

1700 shows his 32 direct ancestors living then as only four pure Finns against nine pure Swedes, 18 Finnish-Swedes, and one German. It proves his theory (as does the example of Flemish descended Ludwig van Beethoven) that environment and tradition are much more formative of national characteristics than racial origins. The very fact that the composers ancestry can be traced back so far so minutely evidences that he is not the peasant-prodigee as he has occasionally been made out to be. The great majority of his ancestors were professional men, ministers of religion, small landowners or yeomen.

He was born on December 8th, 1865, in the small inland town of Tavastehus. His father died when he was two, and the three children were brought up by their mother in her mother's house. An aunt gave him his first music lessons, later he went to the military bandmaster of the town. Janne, as he was called at home, played the violin, his brother Christian (later Professor of Psychiatry at Helsinki University) the piano, and their sister the 'cello. His first composition as a boy, "Drops of Water", was written for their Trio. Music soon took hold of him with a power that set aside all his other interests, but his grandmother considered it too risky a career and insisted that he should study law. He set off for the University, but his law studies did not last more than two terms. All he had—somewhat comically—to show for it was a change of Christian name. His godfather was an uncle, a sea captain. In the fashion of his time Uncle Johan used the frenchified version of his Christian name when abroad. After his death they found a big supply of fine visiting cards which his nephew and namesake felt he might as well use up, and the Christian name Jean has stuck ever since.

An intervention with Grandmama—who ruled the fatherless family—allowed Jean to switch over to the Conservatoire. He studied for six years there, and made a valuable friend in a young Italian pianoforte professor Ferruccio Busoni. He then went to study abroad for some years; in Berlin he made the acquaintance of Richard Strauss, in Vienna Brahms—who rarely praised—thought well of his song compositions. Returning home at the age of 26, he became professor in composition and violin at the Helsinki Conservatoire which has since been renamed after himself. A year later he married the beautiful daughter of a distinguished General and provincial Governor, Jarnefelt, the champion of Tolstoy. Her two brothers made a name in their own right, Armas as Director of the Stockholm Opera and Eero as a painter. *Petite*, graceful Aino Jarnefelt had many gifts; she was a fine pianist, a good linguist, and she had the ability of looking after money all the more useful as her husband had not. Sibelius calls his five daughters his best symphonies. All startlingly beautiful and variedly talented, they were married before they were twenty-one. Ruth Snellman, the actress wife of a well-known actor, lives in Snellman Square in Helsinki, named after a statesman-relation. Two other daughters—one of them now widowed—married bankers; one an architect and the youngest, Mme. Jalas, the conductor of the Theatre Orchestra. They all live in Helsinki. I asked Sibelius if he ever regretted not having a son. "No," he replied, "my daughters are such a joy that I never felt I missed anything." Added his wife—who, notwithstanding a face all wrinkles under her silver white hair, is one of the most graceful

octagenarians that one could meet—"There has always been enough of a boy in my husband for both of us."

The first public performances of Sibelius' compositions received such a reception that press and public besieged the Government to grant him a regular state allowance. Thus, at the early age of 32, he could disembarrass himself of teaching and dedicate himself entirely to his music—and never has a subsidy paid richer dividends. It was then that he built the house in Järvenpää which he named "Ainola" after his wife. Paris was the first city to recognise the rising star. His fame and his repute as a conductor soon spread over the Continent. Sir Granville Bantock invited him to England. As long ago as 1914 the University of Yale made him an Honorary Doctor. He was never a Bohemian starving for his muse, never had to fight for recognition; few composers have lived so smooth a life or have been so successful right from the start. His brow ploughed with deep furrows, his face of a Nordic Jacob who has battled with the Angels, reflects his inner battles rather than his outward circumstances. He has recast tenaciously works that roused the world to enthusiasm because they did not satisfy him completely. He has been a dreamer all his life. As a boy he walked the forests in search of fairies and goblins. All his life he has been supersensitive to the rhythm of nature, a ray of light, the falling of a leaf, the patter of rain. He still can sit for long silent hours to listen to the intensive life of the night. For his ear each note of nature has its musical value. Rosa Newmarch has described how he took her to see the mighty rapids of Imatra. "Sibelius", she recounts, "had at that time a passion for trying to catch the pedal notes of natural forces. The pedal note of Imatra no man has gauged, but he often seemed satisfied with the results of his rapt listening, when he caught the basic sounds of forest, or of the wind whistling over lakes and moorlands." Once he stopped on a walk irritated by the pungent smell of hemp; when he came home it inspired him to a grotesque "Capriccio."

Most of his composing was done before he touched the piano. He wandered in the woods, sat up late on his balcony overlooking the lake, wrestling mentally while a work was taking shape in his mind with a preoccupied intensity hardly bearable to those around him. Once he sets himself down to translate the mentally completed composition into notes, it goes at a great pace. His pen whizzes over the sheets, he composes all the instruments at the same time so that the entire score springs up simultaneously, bar by bar. He is a great and affable talker, but his work is anathema in his presence. Once when he got quite aggressively angry he apologised afterwards! "You know how the wings of a butterfly crumple at the merest touch—so it is with my compositions, the very mention is fatal."

He has not published a major composition these last twenty years or so but—piecing together circumstantial evidence—his family and intimates believe that he has an Eighth Symphony ready and may be working on a Ninth. Did he not once admit himself: "For three score years back I cannot remember a day when I have not thought in music." For him music begins where words end. He likes talking about nature. He can still recall the exact colours of a pheasant which, as a youth, he once saw flying against the setting sun, and every autumn he follows the migratory

birds, the wild swans flying south. The man has many facets, ranging from the Grandseigneur to the anchorite. He dresses fastidiously, is a connoisseur of food, and has a Socratic capacity for wine. He nearly chain smokes Havana cigars; their absence was his greatest privation of the war. Many stories still go the round of Helsinki of fabulous parties of the younger Sibelius with fellow musicians, actors, writers and painters in Rabelaisian conviviality. His interests are vast, he has never ceased loving the Greek and Latin classics of his College days, and he is well read especially in philosophy and history.

Nowadays, in his very old age when a visit to twenty miles away Helsinki has become an expedition, he listens to concerts every evening by his powerful radio set in his library into the early hours of the morning, yet rises early. Broadcasting, he holds, has materially spread the cult of good music. He has a theory that composers should write specifically for the radio, where the woodwinds come out well, but the strings tend to lose a good deal. Talking to him I was repeatedly surprised by the absence of any pose, by his still very quick comprehension and his close contact with music everywhere. As to his own taste, Beethoven—both as man and as composer—is his idol. He considers Mozart and Mendelssohn the greatest orchestral composers, thinks Wagner too rich—though he does not seem to mind the overrichness of Bloch—and finds Puccini too perfumed, though, on the other hand, he admits to liking Verdi. We had been standing near a shelf in his library, entirely filled with books on himself. It was a darkish day, and suddenly the room lit up. "Look," cried Sibelius, as he walked with firm step to the window and gazed out at the forest "now the sun comes." On the spur of the moment, though I feared that he might dismiss it as a reporter's superficial question, I asked him: "If you could hear only one more piece of music in your life, which would you choose?" He stood silent for a moment, glanced at the Rembrandtesque vision of the massed shafts of sun rays between the tall stems of silver birches, and then said quietly: "I think—above everything else—Handel's *Largo*."

KEES VAN HOEK.

TRADE UNIONS IN FRANCE

TRADE UNIONS stem from the economy of our age. Marx sounded a clarion call to workers everywhere to unite. He misjudged human loyalties, for trade unions are reared in national soils. In France, labour life reflects the same influences that condition her political life. Her parliament is fractioned, her trade unions splintered. French trade unions owe their origins to the Waldeck-Rousseau law of 1884. Once the right to associate was legalised, workers organised dually, in unions and bourses de travail. Unions and bourses fused to form the Confédération Générale du Travail, the French T.U.C.

The period till 1914 was an heroic age. The C.G.T. advanced the traditional claims for better pay and conditions of work, soon adding demands for "the three eights", eight hours each of work, sleep and leisure. It was of course antimilitary for "workers bear the cost of all wars, should

they bear arms to massacre other workers?". It was suspicious of "government, the ally of the patron". It worked for the end of wagery and the master class. It advocated the revolutionary general strike to secure the emancipation of the workers and to prevent war. At the Congress of Amiens 1906, "the constitutive charter of French trade unions", it decided to keep aloof from all political parties. The rebellious heritage of France seemed incarnate in her syndicats. May day processions were redolent of revolutionary grandeur. Syndicats rejoiced in being anti-patriotic. Historians who like to tidy human growth explained the emergence of this fearsome phenomenon as socially logical. Just as the bourgeoisie had replaced an effete aristocracy, so the tiers état were to replace the exhausted bourgeoisie. Since 1909 this C.G.T. was guided by the statesmanlike hands of Léon Jouhaux. The war in 1914 came as a shock to the trade union world. The only war it had envisaged was one against capitalism for "workers have no patrie, all wars are an attack on the working classes." Yet everywhere workers marched against workers. This blow however proved creatively testing. War transformed the C.G.T. from a rebel stronghold into a bastion of society. Unions found they could no longer isolate themselves from the nation for they were part of the patrie. They became aware of the constructive role they could play. They accepted it as their duty, to rebuild, reorganise and reconstruct and share in the reconstruction.

So the C.G.T. associated itself with the post-war social and economic renovation, in creating an International Labour Office and a League of Nations. But war had also fostered Red Revolution, and the Soviet bird song was heard appealing and raucous across the plains of Europe, and trade unions that had kept aloof from national politics became entangled in world politics. Red Moscow gave focus to those who still held pre-war "anti", feelings and to the vast unanchored, whom success had swept into the movement. Complaints arose against leaders who had allied themselves with the bourgeoisie, who had compromised with their masters, who had accepted the League of Nations, the new Holy Alliance of Capitalist States. At the splinter Congress of Lyons, 1921, the dissidents raised the cry *Vive la République Internationale des Soviets* and seceded to form the break-away C.G.T. Unitaire. So the French trade-union world was splintered as a result of forces outside the ambit of unionism, and C.G.T. and C.G.T.U. vilified each other and outbid one another for workers' support. The C.G.T. sought to teach workers how to use the tools for their liberation. In 1924 it issued a programme based on workers' control and an industrial democracy. In 1928 it helped to inaugurate the welfare state. In 1934 it summoned an États Généraux du Travail to thrash out a plan for economic well being. Political instability however went parallel with economic dislocation and Fascist groups in 1934 broke out in open rebellion. The *riposte* was speedy. Democracy rallied to form a Rassemblement Populaire, and C.G.T. and C.G.T.U. reunited. They serenaded their manifestations with the Internationale and the Marseillaise. On the crest of that wave, Léon Blum surged to power. The unified C.G.T. took control of the explosive strike fever and in June 1936 secured the Accord Matignon.

Unity had been forced on C.G.T. and C.G.T.U. by Fascist attacks, but

there were other equally potent reasons. France had but to glance beyond the Vosges where with menacing ease Hitler had wrecked the most powerful trade union movement in Europe. Moreover Muscovy was at last provoked by the Hitler dogma of Nordic expansion to re-form with France her traditional alliance. Stalin did not wish to have a divided France for an ally. The Laval-Stalin Pact geared labour unity. At the fusion Congress of Toulouse, C.G.T. and C.G.T.U. reunited. The cracks were but plastered over. Deep was the concern over Munich. Munichois and anti-Munichois, pacifists and bellicists divided the C.G.T. When it was seen that appeasement could not placate the dictators, belated negotiations began between London, Paris and Moscow. Then came the thunderbolt. To a bewildered world, there came the dread, meaningful news of the Ribbentrop-Molotov Pact. And with pliant obedience, the C.G.T.U. broke away again from the C.G.T. There occurred the new scission in September 1939. In tragic sequence there followed the invasion of France, the June exodus, the Conspiracy of Bordeaux. France suffered the ugly apparatus of German occupation. Under the shelter of enemy bayonets, Pétain and Laval imposed the Charte du Travail, which all recognised as Reaction's revenge for the Matignon Agreements. In September 1940 they disbanded the C.G.T. They drove the C.G.T. underground. It proved a perilous and heroic experience, full of grandeur and sacrifice. Then again affairs beyond France came to shape her trade unions. On May 1943 Hitler invaded Russia. One dark night in that month, the break away unions reunited with the C.G.T. by the Perreux Agreement, against the invader and Vichy and to work for the Restoration.

It was a united C.G.T. that gave the order for the General Strike to aid the Allies in August 1944, that linked up with the National Council of Resistance, that sent delegates to the Consultative Assembly at Algiers, that welcomed de Gaulle. And again a united C.G.T. took part in the Reconstruction, the second in this Thirty Years War 1914-45. And again history repeated itself. While Europe was still groping to recovery, the shadow of Muscovy fell over the land. America sought to heal the war wounds by a European Recovery Programme. But Russia that had so victoriously aided Europe against both the Black and Brown Fascisms suspected her allies. When France responded to the offer made by Marshall, Stalin reacted sharply and Communist leaders launched a violent campaign against the Marshallisation of France. Russia's war effort, Communist self-sacrifice, post-war adhesions, all resulted that Communists dominated the C.G.T. and in December 1947 they drove Jouhaux and his friends into secession to form the C.G.T. Force Ouvrière. It was the third secession since 1914 and the gravest. For Communists now controlled the C.G.T., with its finances and its prestige, even its journal *L'Humanité*.

Trade Union disunity is further intensified by still another grouping the Confédération Française des Travailleurs Chrétiens. In that period of Marxist sway, when Black and Red Internationals competed for workers loyalty, the Holy Father issued the Encyclicals, *Rerum Novarum* and *Quadragesimo Anno*. Mother Church pleaded for industrial peace, for a just wage and the force of religion to sustain workers. Christian trade

unions were formed which in 1919 federated as the C.F.T.C. So clearly were its members "labour" that even the orthodox could not label them "jaunes". They worked with the reunited C.G.T. during the war against the *Charte du Travail* and to launch the strike to hasten the Liberation and the Restoration. The C.F.T.C. adds to the pluralism of French unions. Thus Trade Unions in France bear the impress of her people's individualism. They have moved far from their origins, for they are a *movement*. They indicate how workers mirror the national habitat, (in Russia they are state unions, in the U.S.A. they embody the dualism of the A.F.L. and the C.I.O., in Britain they embrace the statesmanlike unity of the T.U.C.). And in addition they have become politicalised. The largest centre, the C.G.T. (under Frachon), claims a membership of some 1,500,000 and is the trade union wing of the Communist Party. The C.G.T.F.O. (under Jouhaux) with a membership of about 1,000,000 is the trade union link with the Socialist Party, the C.F.T.C. with a membership of some 750,000 (under Tessier) is the industrial ally of the M.R.P. There are further such bodies as the *Confédération des Cadres*, the C.G.C., a federation of trade unions of executives and even unions with no affiliation to any centre. Even their figures are unreliable and the system of membership cards lends itself to doubt. Each centre issues cards and stamps to local unions and calculate their membership on the number of cards issued and not on the contributions received. Criticisms of trade unions have been continuous. Today critics complain that association rights have replaced the right to associate. Yet in spite of their divisions, in spite of their political affiliations, they contain a reserve of might and loyalty which enriches the lives of its members and constitutes a human challenge to the French economy. France would be the poorer without her unions.

VICTOR COHEN.

ROBERT BROWNING

RECENTLY quite a number of new books about Robert Browning have appeared. It is a fact well worth remembering that hitherto literally hundreds, both in England and in other countries, have been published, all, without exception, evoking a singularly consistent picture of this great English poet, the picture of a man of genius whose actual life did indeed approach the stature of his poetry, and that the majority by far were the testimonies of those who knew him personally. In the light of some of the recently proffered theories, it is interesting and important to recall these testimonies, for, as Mr. H. C. Duffin has remarked, ignorance about Browning is as dense and pervading as a December fog, so the public, lacking any yard-stick of comparison, are likely to believe as authentic any information offered them.

The key-note of the earlier, contemporary testimonies, was struck by Walter Savage Landor in the words he wrote in acknowledgment of the dedication of *Luria*:

... Since Chaucer was alive and hale
No man has walked along our roads with step
So active, so enquiring eye, or tongue
So varied in discourse...

William Sharp described Browning's as "the robustest intellect of the century," remarking that "He was essentially manly, so manly that many frail souls of either sex philandered about his over-robustness. From the twilight gloom of an aesthetic clique came a small voice belittling the great man as 'quite too loud, painfully excessive', 'but the consensus of opinion was that he was a man of indescribable charm,' a man to 'captivate any woman of kindred nature and sympathies.'" And it is clear that he captivated many besides the famous woman-poet who became his wife; all his life, as G. K. Chesterton tells us, he was friendly chiefly with women, who, with the outstanding exceptions of Joseph Milsand, the French critic, Alfred Domett, and Carlyle, were his closest friends. He is variously described as having in his early years "great comeliness and simple grace of manner", with a rare grace also in all his movements, and a characteristically high poise of the head, which made him appear taller than he actually was. "A swift alertness pervaded him, noticeable as much in the rapid changes of expression, as in the deepening and illuminating colours of his singularly expressive eyes, and in his sensitive mouth", and he had what was described as "a greyhound-like apprehension, which often grasped the subject in its entirety before its propounder himself realised its significance". According to Mrs. Bridell-Fox he was "slim, dark and very handsome", and the actor Macready said that he looked and spoke more like a youthful poet than any man he had ever seen. Mrs. Bridell-Fox gives an attractive and characteristic picture of him when he was about twenty-three, and she still a child:

"I remember . . . when Mr. Browning entered the drawing-room, with a quick, light step; and on hearing that nobody was at home but myself, he said, 'It's my birthday to-day; I'll wait till they come in', and sitting down at the piano, he added, 'If it won't disturb you, I'll play till they do'. And as he turned to the instrument, the bells of some neighbouring church suddenly burst out with a frantic merry peal. It seemed, to my childish fancy, as if in response to the remark that it was his birthday."

In childhood, according to his first biographer, Mrs. Sutherland Orr, he was handsome, vigorous and fearless, and early developed an unresting activity and a fiery temper. His energy of mind naturally made him a quick learner, so much so that when he was first sent to school his proficiency in reading and spelling was so far ahead of the other children that the mothers complained, and it was thought best to remove him from the school. Certainly the pupils had little chance against a boy who while still so small that his head was scarcely above the dining-table would walk around it, supporting himself by his hands and extemporising verse aloud. Moreover, at the age of eight he was able not only to read but to delight in Pope's translation of Homer, and used to go about declaiming some of the couplets with a most earnest air. Mrs. Orr, who was a close personal friend, says that "he clamoured for occupation from the moment he could speak"; the result was that when he could read he laid siege to his father's library, said to consist of over six thousand books, and became, as Chesterton says, "perhaps the most educated man that ever lived," although by the test of actual schools and universities "he will appear to be one of the least educated men in English literary history." "He was," Chesterton adds, "a keen artist, a keen scholar, he could put his finger on

anything, and he had a memory like the British Museum." His voracious reading made him familiar with all sorts of unusual subjects, and almost the last book published in his life-time, *Parleyings with Certain People of Importance in their Day*, is concerned with characters of whom scarcely anyone, even the most cultivated, has ever heard: Daniel Bartoli, Francis Furini, Gerard de Lairesse, and so on. It is not surprising that a stereotyped University Course held little appeal for so powerful and original a thinker, who already, at the age of eighteen, was overflowing with more knowledge than the University syllabus could offer him; and it is amusing to recall that this man who lacked any academic background was quite overwhelmed in later years with academic honours, his qualifications having been acquired in his own way, independent of orthodox education.

All through his early years he was, as he himself later described it, "passionately religious," and one of the ministers of a place of worship he frequented in his youth said sixty years later that "his face is present to my memory still. It was the most wonderful face in the whole congregation—pale, somewhat mysterious, and shaded with black, flowing hair, a face whose expression you remember through a life-time." His was in fact the kind of personality that caused one woman who knew him in later years to say that, even though he only met you in a crowd and made some commonplace remark, you went for the rest of the day with your head up. He possessed what has been described as a rare quality of physical magnetism, and people were known to say that a handshake from Browning was like an electric shock. There is a story of a nervous lady who, during a "literary afternoon," suddenly rose from her seat and told her hostess she could not continue to sit beside the gentleman who was talking to Mrs. So-and-so because his near presence made her quiver all over, "like a mild attack of pins and needles." We can well imagine the effect of such a personality on Elizabeth Barrett, and understand how much of that intense nervous energy came to be transmitted to her to further the healing of both body and mind—for both had been weakened through contact with a very different personality, a father who, as she herself once wrote to Browning, would rather see her lying dead at his feet than resolutely opposing his wishes.

There are many fascinating word-pictures of Browning in middle life. The American poet and critic, Bayard Taylor, who met him in Italy, described the "great cordiality" of his greeting, his "lively, cheerful manner," quick voice and perfect self-possession, and thought that the strong individuality which marked his poetry was expressed not only in his face and head but in his whole demeanour. This was when Browning was thirty-five. Ten years later Nathaniel Hawthorne spoke of him as looking younger and even handsomer than two years earlier, and his grey hairs seeming fewer. "He talked a wonderful quantity in a little time . . . and was very efficient in keeping up conversation with everybody, and seemed to be in all parts of the room, and in every group, at the same moment; a most vivid and quick-thoughted person—logical and commonsensible." He added an interesting touch: "His conversation has an effervescence which you cannot catch even if you get the very words that seem imbued with it." And there is a charmingly human note in the remark that "his nonsense is of a very genuine and excellent quality, the

true babble and effervescence of a bright and powerful mind; and he lets it play among his friends with the faith and simplicity of a child." Elizabeth Browning, in one of her letters, relates how "Robert and I go to the toy-shops and buy Pen's toys; and Robert spent the whole of last Sunday morning between breakfast and church-time in learning to spin a top, I standing by and giving important counsel. He said he considered it a 'religious duty'—a doctrine which I hope you won't set down as heretical."

Hawthorne's wife made the curious statement that she met Browning one day in Rome, in April 1859, and "he rushed at me from a distance and seemed to come through the carriage in his way to me," which rather coincides with Hawthorne's impression that he "seemed to be in all parts of the room and in every group at the same moment." Chesterton describes Browning about this time as "middle-sized, well-set-up, erect, with somewhat emphatic gestures." His hair was still fairly dark. Chesterton thinks his whole appearance was finely and truly represented by Watts' portrait in the National Portrait Gallery, which bears, so Chesterton asserts, one of the many testimonies there are to Watts' grasp of the essentials of character, since it is the only portrait of Browning which gives primarily the air of vitality, even, he says, of "animal virility," tempered, but not disguised, with a certain touch of the pallor of the brain-worker. His manner in society was "that of a man anxious if anything to avoid the air of intellectual eminence." According to some he was at times "talkative and noisy to a fault," but Chesterton wisely comments that "there are two kinds of men who monopolise conversation, the first those who like the sound of their own voice; the second those who do not know what the sound of their own voice is like, and Browning was of the latter class. His volubility in speech had the same origin as his voluminousness and obscurity in literature—a kind of headlong humility."

It seems that there were two things which aroused in Browning what Chesterton has called a consuming hatred: spiritualism of a spurious kind, and any intrusion into the private lives of either himself or his wife. In this latter connection he wrote to Isabella Blagden in January 1863, nearly two years after his wife's death, of the "miseries" he was suffering through being "pestered with applications for leave to write her life." "I have refused," he said, "and there is an end." In our own age, when personal revelations are demanded almost as a right, such an attitude is so little understood that it has to be interpreted as at worst "pathological," at best "amusing," and it cannot be realised apparently that it springs from nothing more nor less than a profound reverence for life and personality which is inevitable to the innately religious type to which Browning belonged. Chesterton remarks that many of his poems "were marked by a certain trait of which by its nature it is more or less impossible to give examples," and the peculiarity of this "occasional coarseness," as he calls it, is that it is always used to express a wholesome fury and contempt for things which undoubtedly deserve contempt and should be subjected to it. This is exactly the forthright attitude so greatly needed in these days of compromise and apathy. It might seem that Browning's propensity for calling a spade a spade without reserve conflicts with his extreme sense of delicacy and personal reticence, but actually the reverse is true;

it is precisely the man who sees things in their true perspective, and, like Albert Schweitzer, feels reverence for life as a passion, who is singularly sensitive to life's most personal and intimate aspects, and therefore knows exactly what is permissible in dealing with such aspects, and what unpardonable. He also sees evil wherever it may be hiding, and has the courage to treat it unsparingly.

Nettleship, a great student of Browning in his time, wrote the truest words and gave the clearest clue to the poet's unique personality when he said: "Weary yourself as you may in tracking the labyrinths of Browning's personality, you can only find your way to its heart by holding fast the truth that Browning's is the artist's mind, that its first sign-marks are receptiveness and creativeness hand in hand." He further spoke of the impartiality with which he chose, and delighted in treating, themes as wide asunder as the poles, of his "revel of invention in song or speech; his boundless delight in production." It is useless to consider Browning except in the light of outstanding genius; for such consideration a wide knowledge of the psychology of genius is essential, and such knowledge is rare. Jung, who almost alone among psychologists has come near to understand the peculiar constitution of the creative artist, says that "every creative person is a duality or synthesis of conflicting impulses. On the one side he is a human being with a personal life, while on the other side he is an impersonal, creative process." Always the genius is a "dual personality," with conflicting desires; always he is to some extent what is known in contemporary psychological language as schizophrenic. It must be recognised that such people are confronted by unique problems, and live an inner life of a nature quite incomprehensible to the average man, and biographies which take no account of these all-important facts cannot be regarded as reliable.

DALLAS KENMARE.

THE GENERAL ELECTION IN ULSTER

IN which of the Western Democracies can the overall result of a General Election be predicted with absolute certainty? From those who oppose the Partition of Ireland loose and wordy eloquence about dictatorship has been issuing in greater volume than usual over the last few months. Northern Ireland went to the polls on October 22nd to elect members for fewer than half the 52 seats in the House of Commons. Already, 25 members had been returned unopposed. Much is made of such a matter as the number of uncontested seats in Northern elections, and facile comparisons are made with Iron Curtain countries. The Unionists, led by Lord Brookeborough, will form the Government of Northern Ireland for the next five years, and the elections just finished differed in no remarkable way from any of the seven which the North has had since 1921. On the face of it, the fact of a political party exercising power for more than a generation points either to that party's possession of extraordinary competence in administration or, alternatively, to inhibitions on the conventional functioning of the machinery of democracy. In the case of the North

of Ireland the Unionist Government enjoys no special inspiration nor does it maintain itself in power by the system of Fascist muzzling of opposition that enthusiastic anti-Partitionists accuse it of employing. Still, all is not well in the North.

In the 23 contested seats on October 22nd only 61.5 of the electors took the trouble to vote. The Unionist *Belfast Telegraph* commented: "How can one account for the small general poll, and especially for the fall in the vote for the Government? . . . it seems fair to conclude that many Unionists abstained from voting in this election, not from apathy, but as a dissatisfaction protest; they were not fully persuaded that they should vote for the Government party as at present constituted, and still less that they should vote against it."

This is the first time that Unionist discontent with the Government has been allowed to show itself in an Ulster General Election. In the past the silence of critics has been self-imposed. The compelling necessity for unity against enemies of Ulster has appeared to the majority of Ulstermen to be a good reason for rallying behind a Government certain to maintain the connection with Britain, whatever the shortcomings of that Government might be in other respects. Over the years the party representation in the Ulster House of Commons at Stormont has been remarkably stable because the fundamental election issue has remained unchanged. About two-thirds of Ulster's population of nearly 1,400,000 are Protestants, and firmly support the historic cause of the Union with Great Britain. An Ulsterman's attitude to this vital question is today determined by his denominational grouping almost as inflexibly as during the violent controversy over Gladstone's 1886 Home Rule Bill, when Lord Randolph Churchill whirled through the North of Ireland driving home the catching slogan: "Home Rule means Rome Rule."

The situation seems to contain the elements of permanence. In the Irish Republic all political parties, it is true, oppose Partition and in recent years the agitation for the re-integration of Ireland has clearly strengthened, conducted, as it is, not only by Irish politicians, but also by a section of the British Labour Party important numerically and including several M.P.s well-known to be able and persevering. Probably an easy majority of the Bevanite members are anti-Partitionist. In 1949 Mr. Attlee's Government passed the Ireland Act, which declared that Northern Ireland's status would not be changed against the wishes of the Northern Parliament. On that occasion nearly 200 Labour M.P.s either abstained from voting or went into the lobbies against the Government, and five Junior Ministers were dismissed.

Consequently, the Ulster Protestant cannot feel that the North's continuing to be part of the United Kingdom is something accepted as above political argument even in England. He is, therefore, compelled in a sense to suspend his right to use his vote to disagree with the Government on matters of ordinary policy. The Labour movement in the North is very weak. Indeed the Northern Ireland Labour Party has only now made up its mind to accept the constitutional position. Its decision to do this had the effect of a small tonic in this year's General Election, but the Party is unrepresented in the Northern House of Commons in spite of an increased vote.

At Stormont there is no opposition of a constructive kind. Of the nine Nationalist members two are abstentionists, and all are, of course, strongly orientated towards Dublin. More than that, they take little interest in Ulster's economic problems, which would certainly not be solved by the abolition of the Border. Northern Ireland has always had more unemployed than the rest of the United Kingdom. In his Budget speech this year the Finance Minister said that in recent years the position of the North had become even more markedly unfavourable. The area has not yet recovered from the effects of the industrial depression of the Thirties. With the War came an improvement, but since 1945 the unemployment figures have been much higher than in the British development areas, of which Merseyside has tended to have the highest rate—about 4 per cent.—against the North's rate of about 8 per cent. The fact that there is no compulsory military service in the North is not enough to explain the unemployment figures.

Unionist Ministers are far from complacent about the problem, and placed it during the election campaign as second in importance after the issue of partition. Lord Glentorn argued that the situation would be much worse if the Border were abolished. He said that he had asked "a very responsible person" in the shipbuilding firm of Harland and Wolff how such an event would affect the firm. The answer was that it would close down. Lord Brookeborough maintained that his Government deserved credit for "its energetic measures to cope with a problem of quite exceptional difficulty." The Minister of Labour compared conditions in the North with those in the Irish Republic and said: "I mentioned Eire as a country in which there is still no system of medical benefit for all persons, and it is just as well to remind you that the Eire social service system falls far below ours in other respects also. For instance, there are no retirement pensions in Eire. There is a school of thought that sees no hope for Northern Ireland unless we have a fuller control of our finances and economy." The last sentence is important. Mrs. Irene Calvert, who has sat in the Ulster Commons for eight years, recently announced that she would retire from political life, and in the General Election she did not stand as a candidate for the Queen's University seat which she had held. She said: "As an economist, I am now convinced that it is quite impossible for us to improve our tragic unemployment circumstances, or control our cost of living, so long as we are deprived of control over our entire finances and trade. I have spoken of our higher level of unemployment as tragic, and tragic it is in the fullest sense of the term, not only because of the obvious waste of material and human resources, but also because unemployment is the rot which undermines our social services and the standard of living of each and all of us. These fundamental matters today require a new approach. The circumstances of 1920 are not necessarily the circumstances of 1953. The sooner that is realised the better for the prosperity of the Six Counties."

The notion that the Ulster Government should have more power is not new. The powers reserved to the Imperial Parliament by the Government of Ireland Act, 1920, are extensive and include not only matters that may loosely be called political, such as foreign policy and the armed services. The Imperial Parliament also reserves the imposition and ad-

ministration of Customs and Excise duties, Income Tax, Sur-Tax, Profits Tax and Excess Profits Tax. All these are regulated by the Chancellor of the Exchequer at Westminster in exactly the same way as for the rest of the United Kingdom. The principal matters of taxation under the direct control of the Parliament of Northern Ireland are Death Duties, Stamp Duties, Motor Vehicle Duties, Entertainments and Betting Duties; the "Transferred Revenue" amounted to about £7,500,000 in 1951-1952. The "Reserved Revenue" for the same year was more than £62,000,000. The yield for the current financial year is expected to be the same from the "transferred" taxes; the "reserved" taxation is estimated to yield nearly £57,000,000. The main reason for the reduction is the Income Tax and Profits Tax changes announced by the Chancellor of the Exchequer in his Budget.

From the "Reserved Revenue" the cost of services provided by the British Government is deducted; as well as this, the Northern Ireland Government receives a further sum to meet the cost of the local services which it directly administers. After some other minor deductions the amount remaining is handed over to the United Kingdom Exchequer. This is called the "Imperial Contribution," and represents the North's contribution to the cost of such services as defence and foreign relations. The highest "Imperial Contribution" was that for the year 1944-1945, which amounted to more than £36,000,000. For 1951-1952 the amount was £20,500,000; for the current year, £8,600,000.

The great need of Northern Ireland is the attraction of capital investment projects. Some Unionist M.P.s have argued that part of the "Imperial Contribution" would be well spent in promoting industrial undertakings and land reclamation in the North. This attitude was deplored by the present Finance Minister in his 1953 Budget Speech. He said: "Our contribution to Imperial revenue is not a form of tribute; it is a contribution towards forms of Imperial expenditure from which we derive substantial benefit. We obtain our share of the food subsidies, our share of agricultural subsidies administered on a United Kingdom basis. We derive benefit from overseas and diplomatic representation, and we have the protection of the armed forces of the Crown."

Labour M.P.s at Westminster have lately sought to show that the "Imperial Contribution" is swallowed up by contra payments to the North. This contention is based on the cost of consumer and agricultural subsidies. Mr. Geoffrey Bing arrived at a gross total of these payments for 1950 of nearly £21,000,000. In June, 1952, the Ulster Finance Minister said that the agricultural subsidies amounted to £1,592,000 in 1950, and not to £5,330,000, as Mr. Bing alleged. "Furthermore," he said, "to the degree that these subsidies increase the production of foodstuffs, as they are designed to do, it is the British consumer who stands to gain substantially by that result." The North's exports of agricultural produce come to nearly £40,000,000, Great Britain taking far the greater part. The Minister also challenged Mr. Bing's estimate of the cost of the food subsidies, and said that since the reduction to the level of £250,000,000, the North's share assessed on a purely population basis would be £6,250,000. Therefore the total amount now would be less than £8,000,000 against Mr. Bing's figure of nearly £21,000,000.

It is not easy to frame a convincing answer to the question whether Northern Ireland is maintained as a unit by disbursements from the British Exchequer. In July the point was put to Mr. Butler by Mr. Cahir Healy, Nationalist M.P. for Fermanagh and South Tyrone. He asked whether the Northern Government did not receive more by the way of grants and subsidies than it paid as "Imperial Contribution." Mr. Butler answered that there was something in what Mr. Healy said. Lord Brookeborough has said that no change in Northern Ireland's financial relations with Great Britain could increase its taxable capacity. However, there is no doubt that the demand for a change has recently grown. One of the leading linen industrialists in Ulster, Sir Graham Larmor, made a memorable speech during the election campaign. He said: "Some of us with commercial responsibilities are beginning to doubt if the country can afford a Government with only limited authority." Northern Ireland did not control its own destiny, and political considerations should not stand in the way of economic salvation.

It is at last beginning to be officially admitted that the North's taxable capacity is lower than that of Great Britain. At present, it is clear that the North needs consideration as a special problem. On day-to-day financial matters, so to speak, there is a harmonious association between the Northern Ireland administration and Whitehall. But that is not enough. The area suffers from under-development in various fields, and there is no sign that the present system can lead to improvement of the North's economy. A good case can be made for the appointment of a Royal Commission similar to that now investigating Scottish affairs.

FLORENCE O'DONOGHUE.

THE UNITED NATIONS AND HUMAN RIGHTS

THE security of the rights of the individual is generally regarded as one of the achievements of Western Civilisation. It is, in a sense, a product of the Renaissance and the Reformation with their emphasis on the freedom of the individual in art, intellect and religion, reinforced by the growth of economic individualism. The full flowering of the idea of individual rights belongs to the era of "the Liberal Experiment," heralded by Rousseau's revolutionary doctrines, by the American Declaration of Independence with its dogmatic assertion: "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights," with the legal expression of the most important of them in the "Bill of Rights" added to the American Constitution, and finally the classical formulation of Human Rights in the *Déclaration des Droits de l'Homme et du Citoyen* of the French Revolution. The elaboration and enforcement of these individual rights continued throughout the 19th century and down to the period of the First World War. Since then we have seen almost everywhere reactions, both in theory and practice, which have cast doubt upon the "self-evidence" of human rights, and have clearly shown that they are

not "unalienable." We have in fact been forced to ask ourselves whether there is any real meaning in the statement that we are born with certain rights, as individual human beings. We grow up as human beings only in so far as we are nurtured and educated in human society; left to ourselves we should be no more than inefficient animals. To a man in isolation most so-called "rights" would be meaningless. Are they not, in fact, the rights of man *in society*, deriving from society and existing only in so far as they are enforced by society?

The observance of human rights has in large measure depended upon the extent to which they were recognised in the constitutions (written or unwritten) of particular States and enforced by the public opinion and the courts of those States. They were in fact the rights of Englishmen or Frenchmen rather than the Rights of Man in the abstract. No universal code of human rights existed and no supra-national machinery had been created to defend the individual man against oppression. International Law was concerned with relations between governments, with the interpretation and enforcement of treaties and conventions between sovereign States—and only States could be parties to its proceedings. The beginning of a change is observable with the creation of the League of Nations. The Minority Treaties, enforced upon the defeated and the Succession States of World War I recognised the special rights of linguistic, religious and other groups and made the Council of the League responsible for their protection. Similarly the Mandates Commission had to see that the Mandatory Powers fulfilled their obligations towards their wards. The right of petition to the Council and to the Mandates Commission was allowed.

At the end of World War I it was recognised that there were "conditions of labour involving such injustice, hardship and privation of large numbers of people as to produce unrest so great that the peace and harmony of the world are imperilled." Hence the establishment of the International Labour Organisation. By the end of World War II, it was similarly recognised, particularly after the experience of large areas of Europe during the nineteen thirties, that the suppression of human rights by totalitarian States may equally imperil the peace and harmony of the world. Hence the concern of the United Nations with the definition and enforcement of human rights. The Preamble to the United Nations' Charter reaffirms "faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person" and declares that nations should "practice tolerance and live together in peace with one another as good neighbours." Article 55 of the Charter binds the signatories to further the "respect for, and observance of, human rights and fundamental freedoms." This implies that individuals now become a subject of international law—an important step forward—in theory—and one of which the full implications have certainly not yet been recognised in principle nor realised in practice. The Charter declares one of the purposes of the United Nations to be "promoting and encouraging respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language or religion" (Art. I, para. 3, repeated in Art. 55 (c)). Responsibility for fulfilling this function is vested in the General Assembly and, under its authority, in the Economic and Social Council (Art. 60).

It seems therefore that the General Assembly itself has a responsibility for enforcing human rights, but the Charter nowhere defines these rights. A number of complaints by States about infringement of the rights of their nationals by other States have been brought before the Assembly but based on Treaties between the States concerned (e.g. India and Pakistan concerning treatment of persons of Indian origin in South Africa) and in no case on Article 55 of the Charter. In the case mentioned, South Africa denied the competence of the U.N. on the basis of Art. 2 para. 7 of the Charter: "Nothing contained in the present Charter shall authorise the U.N. to intervene in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any State or shall require the Members to submit such matters to settlement under the present Charter." Other attempts by the Assembly to deal with similar complaints have come up against the same obstacle even though the issues have been raised on the basis of Treaty obligations and danger to friendly relations (Arts. 34 and 35) and not on the basis of Human Rights under Art. 55. In no case has an initiative come from an individual.

It was noted above that the Charter does not define the human rights to be enforced. Therefore an 18-member Commission on Human Rights was set up by the Economic and Social Council—and produced the Universal Declaration of Human Rights which was accepted without opposition, but with some abstentions, notably U.S.S.R. and South Africa, at the Assembly meeting in December, 1948. This Universal Declaration is a statement of principles which has no binding force upon Member States—and indeed most of its articles are too general to be capable of legal enforcement for which the Declaration provides no machinery. To make the observance of human rights internationally effective two further steps are necessary:—

(1) the drafting and acceptance of a Convention setting forth in legal form the rights to be guaranteed and enforced, and

(2) the drafting and acceptance of a Convention providing the machinery for enforcement.

It is upon the former of these tasks that the Human Rights Commission is now engaged. It was anticipated that this could be ready for presentation to the Assembly in 1950. In fact, the Commission has this summer held its ninth session—lasting for eight weeks—and is still very far from concluding this part of its task. One might have thought that the transformation of the accepted Declaration into a legally enforceable document was in the main a technical task which should not present any great difficulty. In fact, the Commission has run into two almost insuperable difficulties. One arises from the disparity in existing stands of rights in different parts of the world: the other from the ideological differences between the two blocs more or less equally represented on the Commission. If rights are defined too generally they become almost unenforceable: if they are defined too specifically and with the standards of the less advanced countries in mind, then they may actually have the effect of limiting their application in advanced countries; while if the standards of the advanced countries are adopted, the rights may be quite impractical so far as less advanced communities are concerned.

The ideological clash revealed itself in a demand by the eastern bloc

countries for the inclusion of economic and social rights (e.g. the right to work, to adequate housing, minimum wages, a decent living) which they regarded as of fundamental importance, whereas the western representatives were concerned with the traditional western civil and political rights and regarded the social rights as something largely outside the sphere of the law. In the end the Commission resigned itself to the preparation of two Covenants, one of Civil and Political Rights and one of Social and Economic Rights. Neither of these is yet completed and the question of their relation to one another and whether States will be free to adopt either or must accept both has not yet been considered. Under pressure of the eastern bloc representatives, there has been inserted as Article 1 in both Conventions a statement of the right of national self-determination, which might be useful as a lever against colonial powers but is certainly not an individual right.

Three points arising from the Ninth Session are significant:—(1) the suggestion that the function of the United Nations in relation to Human Rights will in fact be conciliatory rather than judicial, (2) the decision by a majority of the Commission that complaints of breaches of the Covenant may be made only by States Parties to the Covenant against other States Parties—in other words that neither individuals nor voluntary organisations will have any right of complaint of denial of human rights, and (3) the announcement by the U.S. delegation that its government would not ratify the draft Covenants, on the grounds that the world was not ready for treaties on so comprehensive a scale and that they might not be as effective as had been expected. The U.S. delegation, however, continued to work on the Commission and put forward suggestions for advisory services, studies and annual reports on human rights which would appear to be intended as an alternative to an internationally enforceable code—and of little more than academic value.

The present position is that the United Nations have adopted a Universal Declaration of Human Rights which there is so far no means of implementing. A proposal by the Indian member in 1952 that the Economic and Social Council should authorise an interim plan for remedying certain specific grievances was rejected on the ground that it was impossible to enforce rights not yet defined. The Secretary General has reported that between April, 1951 and May, 1952 he received over 25,000 concrete complaints of infractions of the Declaration (more than 24,000 being cases of political persecution). All he can do is to acknowledge these complaints and state that there is as yet no machinery to deal with them. Even if and when the Commission has completed its two remaining tasks and its proposals have been accepted by the Assembly, it still remains uncertain whether the clause in the Charter denying the United Nations any right of interference in the domestic affairs of its Members will not bar any effective international action. The international enforcement of human rights against the governments of Sovereign States is in fact paradoxical. Either we must await some kind of world government or the protection of Human Rights within its own territory must be left to each Government, increasingly influenced, let us hope, by an enlightened world public opinion.

HAROLD F. BING.

CHRISTMAS IN CHINA

CHRISTMAS DAY 1943 I remember as the day on which the woman was stabbed. It stands out in my memory as an altogether exceptional Christmas: it was my second in China. I was working with the Friends Ambulance Unit at the time and living in the same compound in which the Wei Sheng Chan was situated, the little Government hospital which ministered as best it could, though very inadequately, to the people of Kutsing. Kutsing was a remote sort of place in which to spend Christmas, though not so remote as other places in Yunnan; for the main road from Kunming to the heart of China skirted its old undulating wall and the still more ancient hill which overlooked the city. Yet we who lived there got the feeling that Kutsing was on the edge of nowhere. In winter on a clear day you had only to climb up the hill to the grey ruins of the fort which had been built to watch for the Communist army during its Long March of 1934-5 to glimpse snow mountains, part of the wild border country which lay between us and the frontiers of Tibet. It was little wonder that the Chinese who prospered in the fertile river valleys of Central China had for centuries called this the country of the barbarians. But to return to the unfortunate woman. Some time during Christmas morning she got involved in a fracas in one of the city's opium dens—she was an addict herself—and in the ensuing brawl got in the way of a bayonet. She was taken to the hospital and the doctor in charge sent over to us for assistance.

That Christmas we had with us in Kutsing Dr. Robert McClure, our Medical Director and one of the most colourful personalities who ever came to China. Auden and Isherwood met him in Honan in the late thirties and described him in their *Journey to a War* as "a stalwart, sandy, bullet-headed Canadian Scot with the energy of a whirlwind and the high spirits of a sixteen-year old boy." As a bare description of the most untypical missionary I ever set eyes on, it will do. On this occasion Bob could not get to the hospital quick enough, with a group of us trailing after him to assist or watch and help catch the flies which were sure to be flitting around the far from sterile operating theatre. McClure gave his customary running commentary in terms of damaged carburettors and broken pipes while he was probing about in the woman's abdomen. The liver had been penetrated and he plugged it with a piece of muscle and stitched away while the electric light bulb flickered continually in its faulty holder, making a tricky job infinitely more so. Under the ether the 32-year old woman snored away her last Christmas afternoon.

The Chinese, unless they are professing Christians, do not celebrate Christmas, though those in contact with westerners at this time of the year would be drawn into the celebrations. The children in particular were not forgotten. Off one of Kutsing's cobbled streets there was a little white distempered Protestant church with a cross set over the door. Here I once watched a Santa Claus handing out gifts to little almond-eyed children and listened to a girls' choir singing carols in Chinese. Going back to our beds past the shuttered shops of the city, a group of us had started singing "Stille Nacht, heilige Nacht", and those who were still awake on this Christmas Eve peeped through their lattice windows at

us as the foreign men from over the water sang in a Christmas far from home. Few people doubt that home is the place to spend Christmas, just as the Chinese themselves will go home for Chinese New Year if at all possible. And on these Chinese Christmases westerners would get together and do their best with decorations, carols, parties and the like to make their bit of China as much like home as possible.

In some places this was easier than in others—in Chengtu, for example, where I spent my first Chinese Christmas. This is the university city and provincial capital of Szechwan Province; and the green lawns, shady trees and western style buildings of the West China Union University campus provided the kind of environment that brought home nearer. A large number of Chinese and westerners lived together on the campus and there was a well-developed community life. In 1942 there was a group of the R.A.F. stationed in Chengtu. They had driven up the long road from Burma, and for a few months became part of the life of this city. There were dances in the Canadian Mission Hall, football matches against Chinese teams—often followed by unpleasant barracking by the crowds when the Chinese were defeated—and much individual entertainment in missionary homes. Over Christmas these activities were intensified. Carols and excerpts from Gilbert and Sullivan were sung in carpeted drawing rooms, and a fancy dress ball left no doubt in the minds of the delighted coolies who pressed their squat noses against the windows of the hall that foreigners were a pretty queer bunch altogether. Kweiyang, wet muddy transport town in the Province of Devils, was an entirely different setting for a Christmas. Even the Chinese regarded it as a backwater—and very much a stagnant one at that. There was a medical college outside the town presided over by a charming Dr. Li who had once studied at Oxford, which seemed about as remote to him as it did to me; and there was another Chinese doctor with an excellent collection of gramophone records. I cannot recall any other cultural influences of the uplifting kind; the influence was rather one of landscape, which to the Chinese always implies a combination of mountains and water. All about Kweiyang, when the rain did not conceal them, was the most inviting sea of odd-shaped hills you could imagine.

I spent that Christmastide in excursions by jeep or on foot into the surrounding hills. With a friend or two I made my way into valleys far from any main roads, where the tribespeople dwelt in simple homes beside placid streams which flowed between the leaning walls of limestone hills. There were some good climbs among these Kweichow alps, and the kites watched our scrambles along the sharply tilted strata with sullen beady eyes. Adventuring in these hills one had the feeling that one was constantly setting foot in untrodden places. In the English Lakes a year or so ago I was reminded of Kweichow when straddling some crag; but I was struck by the main difference. There was a worn path at my feet, and when you got through the mist to the summit there was always a cairn to prove that someone had been there before you.

It was, I suppose, fitting that I should spend the last of my Chinese Christmases in Peking—or, as it then was, Peiping, the City of Northern Peace. I flew there in a draughty plane from Nanking and managed to get a room in the crowded Wagons-Lit Hotel, the great tourist Mecca of

the inter-war years. It was a tiny room and very hot with the central heating on, and I was glad on Christmas Eve to move over with some friends to a Chinese home built round a courtyard off one of the city's innumerable dusty lanes. Partitions separated an elongated room into three, and I was lucky enough to be put in the central portion where the stove was. I doubt there is a traveller who has ever been to Peking who does not hope one day to return to that loveliest of cities. The giant walls that once surrounded Khanbalyk, the City of the Khan, have looked upon a pageant that is almost a miniature of China's own history. They saw the Mongol Empire shattered when Chaucer was still a young man, and over five hundred years later witnessed the decline of the Manchus while, within the mysterious mazes of the Forbidden City, the Empress Dowager spun her web of intrigue as an empire decayed. Through the rise and fall of dynasties the city has remained—a walled casket holding the splendours of the centuries. On Christmas Eve I climbed up Coal Hill in the heart of Peking, a vantage point for superb views over the flowing roofs of the Forbidden City, which is today preserved as a museum; over the frozen lakes where China's last empress used to go boating in the summertime; and far over the jumbled confusion of the temples, gates and house-tops which stretch to the limits of the outer wall.

This is no place for a catalogue of the Peking sights which made my Christmas there so memorable. Contentedly I wandered the streets and poked my nose into gateways and leaned over marble bridges and watched shaggy two-humped camels padding along the road from the Western Hills. There was no forgetting that Peking had a yesterday. It was just as impossible to be unconscious of its vivid present. The jolliest, happiest people in the world, muffled in padded gowns and fur-lined caps against the cold, thronged the Street of the Bronze Workers and Lantern Street and Jade Street where I went shopping on Christmas morning. On the North Lake young people were skating with far more agility than Mr. Winkle had shown upon the ice at Dingley Dell; and near them the Great White Dagoba, built to commemorate the first visit of the Dalai Lama from Tibet, towered like the ornament on some utterly fantastic Christmas cake from its island base.

On Christmas afternoon I motored out to the Summer Palace in the Western Hills. Snow fell as I strolled round the gardens which the Chinese, with their genius for beautiful names, call the Park of Peace and Harmony in Old Age. West of the frozen lake on which the snow was falling in great white blobs, wooden galleries a mile long with their rafters decorated by delightful little landscape paintings provided a sheltered walk to the Hall of the Serrated Clouds. And snow blurred the sweeping lines of Buddha's Fragrant Incense Pavilion which crowned the Hill of the Ten Thousand Ages. I have known other white Christmases besides this one; yet never one so different from the Christmas of western tradition. There was no turkey; but there was unforgettable "Peking Duck", and the night when four of us found our way to a Mongolian restaurant in a dark alley near the North Lake. It was a dirty little place with a floor of beaten mud. We bought our meat and vegetables raw from the proprietor and cooked them ourselves on a charcoal stove set on a table in the middle of the room. When our morsels were cooked and eaten with

thin fresh pancakes, they tasted excellent; and a favourite Mohammedan dish became one of my memories of that Peking Christmas. For all of us Christmas is a time of retrospect, every card and carol bringing to mind recollections of Christmases past. And I shall not soon forget those Chinese Christmases—each one so different from the others—which I spent in the Middle Flowery People's Kingdom in the forties of this tumultuous half century.

BERNARD LLEWELLYN.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

THE ROLE OF THE UNITED NATIONS

MR. SELWYN LLOYD left London by air for New York on October 18th to lead the British delegation to the eighth General Assembly of the United Nations. That day happened to be the beginning of what we call United Nations Week. Before he left he recorded a talk which the B.B.C. broadcast that same evening, the while he himself was travelling over the mid Atlantic, on the function of the United Nations and the degree of success it had attained in the eight years of its functioning. It was an interesting review, designed obviously to give a fillip to the prestige of the United Nations and to provide grist for the mill of the U.S. Association in our country. Its importance in the day-to-day preoccupations of the ordinary person could be gauged perhaps from the fact that *The Times* the next morning did not even mention it, whereas according to its true importance in the interests of that ordinary person it deserved to be reported in full.

In a gem of summary condensation, lasting only fifteen minutes, Mr. Selwyn Lloyd gave to the United Nations every item on the credit side that goodwill and imagination could muster, and ignored the other side. In particular he recalled what was being done by the World Health Organisation, and featured it as an essential asset on which in the long run the political work of the U.N. must depend for its success. That was a fair point to make. Yet when all is said that can be said to substantiate the claim of the U.N. upon the loyal faith of human beings the world over as a means—the only means discernible to the materialist eye—of avoiding a third world war and its potential final destruction of the human heritage, there yet remains the deep uneasiness of a suspicion that the United Nations, in common with the League of Nations before it, cannot affect the true central issue that now divides the world. Let full credit be given to what the U.N. has already done in the field of defence against aggression, of conciliation among States torn with dissension, and of humanitarian service. These two latter causes were served also by the League of Nations with no decisive effect (as history has established) upon the peace of the world.

The first-mentioned cause, that of defence against aggression, upon which Mr. Selwyn Lloyd laid much stress, is by no means clear in its beneficent quality. What Mr. Selwyn Lloyd claimed was that North Korea's aggression was met by United Nations counter-action, the fifty-

odd member States combining in such an enterprise for the first time. The truce of this last summer constituted the check thus given to aggression by this new scheme of mutual security in action. Mr. Selwyn Lloyd declared—his precise words cannot be quoted because they were not reported and one has to write from memory—that in the future any State contemplating an aggression would be faced by the knowledge that the United Nations would similarly and at once intervene. But he thereby missed an all-important point. The North Korean aggression was in fact, albeit indirectly, a Russian aggression. It was organised, equipped and conducted by Russia. And Russia was a member of the United Nations. She was theoretically therefore involved in a United Nations war of defence—against herself. She was fighting on both sides, on the one side theoretically, on the other in dead earnest. The situation could not afford satisfaction to any person of ordinary commonsense. To quote Korea as a United Nations triumph is at the least an equivocation.

Nor is the case of Korea of any great essential relevance to the problem in hand. The greater Russian aggression is to be seen in the many disturbances, hot or cold, in Asia, Africa, Europe and now in South America, organised by the Kremlin and designed to overthrow the existing system of law and order. Whether in British Guiana through the instrumentality of the People's Progressive Party, or in Persia through the Tudeh Party, in Morocco through the Istiqlal, in Kenya through Mau Mau, or in the European countries, including our own, through the communist-dominated sections of the trades unions, a concerted attack is being made upon the established order. When Mr. Selwyn Lloyd in the broadcast argument above mentioned declared that the United Nations had started with this advantage over the League of Nations, that both the United States and Russia were founder-members, he made a point that sounded good, but was less good than it sounded; and when he went on to submit that so long as affairs were debated within the United Nations, a safety-valve was operating, for so long as the nations talked they did not make war, he made a point that was clearly bad. He added that he himself, sitting next to Mr. Vyshinsky, sometimes had to listen for three hours on end to Mr. Vyshinsky's diatribes against the Western Powers, but bore it willingly because of the preferability aforesaid of talks against bombs.

But has it not occurred to Mr. Selwyn Lloyd that Mr. Vyshinsky is not greatly interested even in the presence of Mr. Selwyn Lloyd or any other of the delegates to the U.N. when he launches his propaganda within the walls of the United Nations? He knows that what he says will be reported in the newspapers of the whole world, and what he says is directed exclusively to that grand audience. Mr. Vyshinsky's talk is in fact a sort of cold bomb, used deliberately by him as such. We are therefore presented with the ironic spectacle of the United Nations itself offering a free platform to the enemy whose purpose it is to destroy the United Nations and every other instrument of civilisation. To argue that it was an advantage to the cause of peace that Russia became an initial member of the United Nations is to argue something demonstrably and even obviously false, proved to be false by what is happening in all the many storm centres which take their cue from the Kremlin; and which often enough take it via the United Nations.

It is, however, an inescapable duty to answer this question: if it be true that the world is split in two, the one part defending the old civilisation rooted in the Christian tradition, the other seeking to impose upon it an atheist, materialist tyranny, would it not be the more Christian and therefore the more profitable gesture on the part of the West to mix and fraternise with the enemy, if only to illustrate and thus to spread the truth of Christian charity? In other words, must we not love our enemy, even when that enemy is out to destroy the Christian Church and to root out Christianity and all spirituality from the earth? What, in short, would Christ do if He were incarnate at this moment? The answer is not really far to seek, for it follows from all one knows of Christian revelation. To love one's enemy is not to condone his crime. God loved Saul of Tarsus, as He loves all His creatures, but Saul had to stop his persecution of God's other and more faithful children. We may love the communists; but we may not love communism. Communism and Christianity are incompatible with each other and are mutually destructive. If communism wins as a way of life, Christianity dies. They cannot flourish side by side. Russian communist leaders have themselves often declared that full communism in Russia is impossible unless and until the whole world is communist, and that in the meantime all that is possible in Russia is a form of socialism.

In that argument the communists are concerned of course mainly with the material factors. They argue that it is impossible, for instance, to abolish money (which is one of their objects) so long as other States, with which they have to exchange the products of their industry or agriculture, retain money as a token or measure of values. That argument is sound. It is equally sound to argue that communism is impossible so long as Christianity survives. The communists at any rate appreciate this fact, and that is why their first concern in the countries they overrun is to stamp out the Christian Church. Now, as it is impossible for Christianity, being the doctrine of omnipotent God, to be suppressed, it follows that communism, the doctrine of mere man and of man's lower or exclusively materialist nature, is doomed. But so long as the so-called Christian West tries to compromise its own standards in the mistaken cause of pretended peace where there is no peace, so long will the doom of communism be postponed. It follows logically, and the inference is wholly typical of the mysterious perfection of God's contrivances, that the first step to the defeat of communism is the re-Christianisation of the West itself.

There is something hollow and unconvincing about the political leaders who, almost without suspecting it themselves, have been jockeyed by the events of our time into the position of defenders of our Christian civilisation. It will dawn upon them sooner or later that before they can begin the definitive accomplishment of their own purpose, they will themselves need to become conscious, practising and faithful Christians. This then is the true miracle of these pregnant times, that by the course of events for which they themselves were responsible in the first instance, the so-called Christians are destined to be converted to Christianity as to an active faith. As the individual seeds sown in the spring are the beginning of the harvest gathered in the autumn—the intervening miracle being

God's exclusive work, though needing a first step on the part of the farmer—so the conversion of individual "Christians" to true Christianity, the sowing as it were of the individual seed, will, through the intervening miracle, yield the harvest of peace and goodwill.

It is not otherwise that the end will be encompassed. Peace is a spiritual thing, the spiritual harvest of a spiritual sowing. It cannot be dictated by the Covenant of a League of Nations nor by the Charter of a United Nations. The method of war as the arbiter in international relations is an evil method that therefore defeats its own object. The arming of fifty odd nations, members of the United Nations, to form an international army for the confusion of an aggressor will not lead to peace, because bad means cannot produce good ends. For nearly half a century we have been deluged with illustrations of the simple truth that peace cannot be manufactured, no matter how good be the machinery, whether it be Covenant or Charter or Locarno Treaty; and can flow only from the hearts of men. Peace is a mystery of our life on earth. The ennobling and exciting thing about the prevailing phase of the mystery is that by the results of our own folly we are being forced to mend our manners and reform our practice. It was the unfaithfulness of professing Christians that produced communism. By going to war in 1914—when communism was a word almost unheard—the "Christian" West started a plunge into materialist methods which has had as its logical outcome the mastery of the Kremlin over half the world. It is the "Christians" who are responsible for communism. It will be the Christians, when they are truly and effectively Christian in faith and in act, who will banish communism and its dreaded scourge from the earth. Mr. Selwyn Lloyd made a masterly review of what the United Nations stands for, so far as the materialist circumstance is concerned. He made no mention of the spiritual problem that is the true and only problem facing mankind. The time will come when such men, in making such a review, will put first things first instead of wholly omitting them.

THE TACTIC OF DISARMAMENT

In the July *Contemporary Review* some reference was made to a proposal made by Mr. Frederic C. Smedley of the United States, about the method of achieving a state of true and total disarmament throughout the world. In my summary of his proposal (pp. 58-9) I wrote: "Mr. Smedley attractively suggests that a bid for total, immediate disarmament from the United Nations Disarmament Commission would be likely to achieve its purpose whether it were agreed to by all the parties concerned or not; for the dissident still-armed governments would be the object of revolt on the part of their peoples." Mr. Smedley has now written to me to point out that a danger of misunderstanding may arise from the possible inference that his proposal envisages an initial *partial* or *sectional* disarmament among the nations of the world, whereas, he writes, "I want the free nations to adopt a draft convention providing for complete disarmament, completely enforced, conditioned as to its going into operation on universal adoption and simultaneous, universal effectiveness."

In other words his proposal is closely allied to the proposal made in this section of the *Contemporary Review* more than ten years ago for a world-

wide disarmament commission functioning in all the capitals of the world. I therefore gladly give the clarification he now sends about his own proposal. The clarification is necessary because of a badly drafted paragraph in his proposal which runs thus: "Holdout governments"—by which epithet he meant those governments which refused to accept the scheme—"holdout governments would soon be placed in a position, even if they do not engage in war, wherein they would have to go along with the program or be overthrown by revolution."

BELGRADE AND GEORGETOWN

What was once the hushed and reverent silence observed for two minutes at the eleventh hour of the eleventh day of the eleventh month each year has become a disturbed and uneasy respite from the crowding perplexities of a rapidly worsening tension. "Tension" at any rate is the word used in the diplomatic circles. Yet the disagreement, bickering, intrigue, riot and subversion that are the constant characteristic of what is happening in four out of the five continents in our harassed world seem by now to have ceased to pull or strain international relations. We have passed beyond mere tension. The situation rather is one of collapse, of broken threads, of resignation to the unlikelihood of improvement or rescue. It is, however, always darkest before the dawn. Maybe this extremity of badness in our public affairs is the necessary circumstance of an impending delivery; for it is palpably true and elementary to the facts of life that God cannot, or does not, help those who refuse to be helped. The gift of free will to man is not an empty theory of the theologian. In a sense there is something exciting in the fact that high diplomacy in our time has landed itself in something like a state of bankruptcy, because it is not in human nature to accept irretrievable defeat. The alternative to such defeat is to be found in recaptured simplicity of faith in the only source of intelligence and welfare available to man, namely in the grace of Almighty God.

It is not perhaps obvious how the "conversion" is to be effected in so traditionally unpromising a field as international politics, where men do not speak the same language, where standards and methods vary, where the only consistent and common practice has been a lawless competition in the acquisition of material spoils for the supposed benefit exclusively and selfishly of one's own sovereign country. The fact, however, that one cannot foresee the way in which miracle will operate is neither surprising nor important, for the incidence of God's omnipotence cannot be foreseen by men. Jugoslavia, British Guiana, Panmunjom, Egypt, Kenya, Nyasaland, Nigeria, Malaya, Indo-China, to mention the more active arenas of the disturbance, offer a baffling spectacle. It is arguable that the bankruptcy must be complete and beyond recovery before an alternative method of conducting our affairs can be thrust upon us. We have at any rate nearly reached the limit of our tether. No sooner is the Korean disturbance brought under control by the signing of a truce than another disturbance breaks out in British Guiana; and the Korean truce itself becomes the occasion of another cold war. Venezia Giulia suddenly becomes another diplomatic battleground.

One of the logical results of these latest disturbances radiated from Trieste in the Old and from Georgetown in the New World is this: that those rather odd sections of opinion in our own country, who have had no patience with General Franco and endless patience with all the communist leaders, whether in the one world or the other, now have to answer an obvious challenge. It may indeed not yet be obvious to those people who shun anti-communist Spain and welcome communist Russia, communist China, communist Jugoslavia and communist British Guiana with open and understanding arms, that this communist menace is the big issue in world affairs; but even to those people, the truth must now be dawning. In Europe, Asia, Africa and America, the normal communist strategy of infiltration through terrorism has been, and still is being, illustrated to a degree that fills normal people with wonder as they survey the virtual encouragement given to it by the muddled people aforesaid.

The most flagrant example is that of their attitude to Tito. They have lionised and feted him, the while he has consistently flouted and even threatened them. Communist dictators do not suffer opposition gladly, even when the opposition is firm and determined. When it is diluted with invitations for State visits and tempered with flattery, it excites the sort of exuberance and contempt we have experienced time and again from Tito. It is on his own terms, and on none other, that he is prepared to deal with the West. He broke with Stalin for the elementary reason that dictators are disposed to dictate, not to be dictated to. Dictators inevitably quarrel with each other, whether it be Hitler and Stalin, or Stalin and Tito. When Tito duly quarrelled with Stalin, the Western leaders proceeded to repeat with Tito the mistake they had already made with Stalin. They had lionised and flattered Stalin because, when he ranged himself against Hitler, they thought he was an ally, or could be made into an ally, against Germany. They discovered their mistake when it was too late, that is, when they had irrevocably handed over half of Christian Europe to communist Russia. They have similarly lionised and flattered Tito because, when in his turn he duly quarrelled with Stalin, they imagined that he was, or could be made into, an ally against Russia. They are now engaged in discovering their second mistake of the series.

The fact that both Moscow and Belgrade are communist headquarters—which is the decisive fact to people of ordinary commonsense—has been regularly ignored by these western leaders. Communists are communists the world over, whether they quarrel with each other or not. Tito has persecuted, and persecutes, the Christian Church as determinedly as ever Lenin or Stalin persecuted it. It is one of the tragedies of a world that has been demoralised by two major wars in half a century, and did not start with any great moral capital, that high principle in policy is to be counted among the casualties. Principle being lost, can the results surprise any reasonable person?

Let one or two recent landmarks in the unhappy tale be recalled. As lately as May 14th last year Mr. Eden, speaking in the House of Commons about the Russian menace, made this confession: "Over and over again the Western nations have sought to build up a reasonable civilised relationship, at least of mutual forbearance, *with our former ally* (my italics)"; and "we have got nowhere." And at that very moment the other nemesis

was being clearly outlined. On April 3rd last year the British, United States and Italian Governments began a conference in London, which lasted five and a half weeks, about Trieste. The result was, not a decision to implement the 1948 promise that Trieste should be restored to Italy, but merely a temporising expedient to allow Italy a small share in the administration of Zone A. The said share amounted to nothing more than the right of an Italian official to put his views about Trieste directly to the Allied Military Governor, who remained in charge. Jugoslavia meanwhile continued to exercise her full control of Zone B. Promptly (May 9th) the Jugoslav Ambassador in London protested to our Foreign Office that the Western Governments could not make decisions about Trieste without Jugoslav "consent"!; and two days later (May 11th) Tito turned his thunder upon the West, roundly rejecting "the entire agreement from A to Z," and threatening that he "would at the right moment do everything that is required." And now—who can be surprised?—when the United States and British Governments decided to withdraw their forces and to hand over full control to Italy in that one zone, just as Jugoslavia has full control in the other, Tito announced that he would regard the presence of Italian forces in Zone A as an "aggression" against Jugoslavia!

Dictators are apt to bend words to their own purpose, after the manner made known to us in a less grim context by Lewis Carroll. "'When I use a word' Humpty Dumpty said in rather a scornful tone 'it means just what I choose it to mean—neither more nor less'." The western leaders are at last (or so we may hope) waking up to the established fact that there can be no agreement or compromise between the mutually destructive causes of Christian civilisation and atheist communism. The Kremlin of course backs Tito, whether Tito needs or wants such backing or not; and Italian nationals have given way to uncontrolled and unwise demonstrations against the lukewarm Western leaders.

November 11th, 1953.

GEORGE GLASGOW.

LITERARY SUPPLEMENT

ALFRED NOYES*

The reminiscences of Alfred Noyes will be read with pleasure not only by his many friends but by the far larger number of people on both sides of the Atlantic who know him by his lectures and his books. If a sub-title were to be chosen it would be *The Story of a Happy Life*, for, apart from the recent loss of his eyesight, it seems to have been roses, roses all the way. If happiness is self-fulfilment, his has been one of the happiest of literary careers. Born to write poetry as others to compose music or to paint pictures, he began to sing in his precocious Oxford days and has been singing ever since. How much of our poetry of the last half-century will survive is anyone's guess, but *The Torch-bearers* and *Drake* will surely find readers long after the present generation

has passed away. Only poets are in a position to assess the technique of a member of their craft, but the general reader has the right to say what he likes and dislikes. What most of us enjoy in Dr. Noyes is the combination of verbal felicity with elevating thought. He is never obscure or commonplace, and at times he rises to the heights. He is in the direct line of succession to Swinburne, one of his earliest admirers, but he has more to say to us for he has reflected on the deepest problems of life and thought. His autobiography is the record not only of a poet's life but of a spiritual pilgrimage which has found its goal in the Catholic Church.

Dr. Noyes possesses the enviable gift of making friends, and the book, as we might expect, is a gallery of portraits. He is a kindly artist, and there are more smiles than frowns on his face. His sharpest arrows are aimed at James Joyce for debasing the moral currency, Bishop Barnes for his rough handling of sacred things, H. G. Wells for his bad manners and pretentious omniscience, and Hugh Walpole for his misuse of the hospitality of a gracious host. Perhaps the most arresting portrait is that of "the gloomy Dean," who, despite his well-known disapproval of the Catholic Church as an institution, finds much to admire in the great Catholic mystics and enjoys the company of a few kindred spirits in that communion. That Dr. Inge possesses one of the finest intellects of our time is recognised by friend and foe, but in these pages he also appears as a mellow octogenarian. It is a feather in the author's cap that he has succeeded in winning and retaining the affection of a man who does not wear his heart on his sleeve.

Two other striking portraits may serve as examples of the author's likes and dislikes. Lord Jellicoe, his neighbour in the Isle of Wight, receives full marks. "He had the simplicity and sincerity of greatness. His kindness and gentleness of manner hardly suggested the man who held the fate of the world in his hand at Jutland. I saw him frequently during the long period of controversy with the Beatty faction about the battle of Jutland. Though the other side was extremely vocal and bitter, and, as I learned afterwards, Lord Jellicoe could have given the most complete and crushing answer, I never heard an ungenerous word from him about the others. He was not only a great Admiral of the Fleet but a great Christian gentleman."

And here is a snapshot of the Duce, once believed to be a great man and now reduced by the revelations of Ciano to the size of a pygmy. Visiting the Palazzo Venezia for the purpose of presenting an address concerning the Keats house in Rome, the author found not an awe-inspiring superman but a third-rate actor. "It seemed to be an essential part of the ceremony that while the visitors were escorted down the long shining floor of this immense room, Mussolini should rise and walk, not towards his visitors, but pompously to and fro at the far end of the room, his chin up and his chest well inflated." During the reading of the address, which had been submitted to him beforehand, "when a formal compliment was introduced Mussolini would elevate his chin and inflate his nostrils as if he were snuffing up incense. I had gone to the Palazzo Venezia fully prepared to find something admirable in the man who had at least drained the marshes, established a punctual train service, and made it possible to send your unlocked luggage from Rome to Venice without losing your shirts on the way. But that brief interview shattered my hope. The pompous little man was not a normal human being; every glance, every gesture was theatrical. The vanity of an actor-manager possessed him to the point of megalomania."

The narrative closes on a major chord with the dinner organised for the author's seventieth birthday. His speech on that occasion is reproduced since it embodies his ideology and reveals the man. "The only ground for that kindness is that, whatever the defects and limitations of my own work may be,

I have truly loved the art of poetry and given the best of my life to it." The greatest poetry is not only music but magic, a subtle alchemy transforming pebbles into shining gems. But it must do something more. "The music has a deeper and richer beauty when it rises from nature into the realm that transcends nature." Wordsworth has shown how it can be done.

G. P. GOOCH.

*Alfred Noyes: *Two Worlds for Memory*. Sheed & Ward. 21s.

COUNT COUDENHOVE-KALERGI

The golden calf of Nineteenth Century Liberalism was parliamentary democracy based upon proportional representation. But the question can very seriously be asked whether, owing to the corporate self-importance of elected persons, there is not a very real antagonism between the policies of parliamentary democracy and the views of pure democracy as now becoming articulate in, let us say, Gallup Polls. To take a practical, although not a perfect, illustration, would the views of an Assembly at Strasburg of which the members were nominated by national Parliaments or Governments be the same as those of an Assembly based upon direct democratic election? One suspects that the answer is "No." In this autobiography, which is also the history of the Pan-Europa movement which Count Coudenhove-Kalergi founded and of associated movements, he gives us the encouraging story of a long fight for an authentic political union of Europe against the nationalist views of Governments, relying upon a traditional mandate to maintain and magnify national sovereignty, and against the uncertain timidities of parliamentarians. Himself with an ancestry which ranges widely and vividly over the breadth of the *Almanach de Gotha* and claiming descent from Charlemagne, Count Coudenhove has made himself the exponent of what can be briefly called the Canolingian Idea. In terms of it he is on his way to achieve immortality. It must be encouraging to the Count that an equestrian statue of the great Frankish Emperor stands outside the doors of Notre Dame in Paris. And it was entirely fitting that he should be presented the first gold medal for services to European Unity by that imperial city of Aachen which bears in its arms both the imperial eagle of Germany and the fleur-de-lys of Royal France. His life is one long protest against the Partition Treaty of Verdun.

The American attitude towards this noble plan, which counts Henri Quatre and Victor Hugo among its progenitors and has in Count Coudenhove its *preux chevalier*, has undergone a total change from the days of Charles Evans Hughes, when it was regarded as a devious scheme to consolidate a debtors' bloc, to those of Mr. George Marshall, who extended a vigorous blessing to this scheme for federating Europe, in part with a view to economising American man-power—but of course the prescription did not apply to America but only to others. The villain of the piece, it emerges clearly from these pages, has been Britain. Count Coudenhove does not scruple to suggest that she has had a traditional and vested interest, under the specious name of liberty, in keeping Europe divided so as to have freedom of manoeuvre in adjusting the balance of power and in sustaining her own splendid isolation. At a time when Briand and the elder Masaryk and Benes had been persuaded to raise the standard, to which Stresemann might rally, of good Europeanism, Ramsay Macdonald and Arthur Henderson were blowing cold. Soon both Stresemann and Briand were dead and the chance to avert Hitlerism's dictatorship of the Third Reich was lost. Count Coudenhove comments very charitably that perhaps, in the 1950's, Britain may at length see her own interest in having a Europe powerful enough to resist invasions which could reach the Channel.

Today the scene repeats itself. We have Konrad Adenauer and Robert Schuman, both good Europeans, but the one nearly eighty years of age and the other already out of office. We have Messrs. Bevan and Crossman leading the campaign in favour of some other plan than that projected for European Union, in part because there is "no need to give publicity to Churchill," and in part because European Socialism in charge must come first. There is one major difference. Sir Winston Churchill writes the introduction to this book by an old personal friend. "The movement towards European solidarity . . . may even prove to be the surest means of lifting the minds of European nations out of the ruck of old feuds and ghastly ravages." However here the hero of Zürich and Strasburg has been unable to carry the enthusiasm of his own party. Count Coudenhove records a profound comment by Mr. L. S. Amery: "Our hearts are not in Europe; we could never share the truly European point of view or become real patriots of Europe"—British adhesion *from the point of view of Pan-Europa itself* would be a catastrophe. Is there any way out of this impasse? I believe that there is. It is the immortal glory of Count Coudenhove that he has dauntlessly striven to realise an idea which, due to his energy, has long ceased to be Utopian. But the Count is as much totally European as his mother, whom he so enchantingly describes, remained utterly Japanese. The route out for Britain cannot lie in isolation. It must not lie in the Machiavellian frustration of the unity for which Europe longs. But, despite Count Coudenhove's argument, it may be beyond Europe. It has to lie in a wider ideal which can embrace all the Commonwealth and Western Europe, for which Europe itself recognises the economic and strategic need—an Atlantic Union which it will require a man of Count Coudenhove's dedication to forge, by breaking into pieces the forces of Anglo-American fratricidal jealousy.

PROFESSOR GEORGE CATLIN.

Count R. Coudenhove-Kalergi: "*An Idea Conquers the World.*" With introduction by Sir Winston Churchill, Hutchinson, 21s.

BOLIVAR

In this fine work, the last in a notable trilogy dealing with successive phases in the history of South America, the crux and theme of the whole tale is the liberation of certain states from Spanish rule. Simon de Bolivar, the "Liberator," was born in Caracas in 1783, of aristocratic lineage, into which Indian and Negro strains had been infused. The early death of his parents detached him from the old family traditions and, at the same time, by the teaching of Voltaire imparted by a tutor, brought new vistas were before his mind. Senor de Madariaga draws a vivid picture of the young man, passionate, pessimistic, but with strong social ideals and ambitions, torn by the conflicting strains of his ancestry. On the Spanish side, he is heir to a proud tradition of power and rule, and, at the same time, to the fine principles of human equality which, according to the author, were the glory of the Church in the New World. On the other hand, as a Creole his soul is seething with irritation and resentment against Spanish domination.

When, in 1799, the young Bolivar journeyed to Spain he was already a rebel at heart, with little faith in God or man. It was not surprising that revolutionary France, which he visited, appealed to his nature. His marriage, in 1802, brought a calming influence to bear on him, but after a short year of happiness his young wife died, leaving him bitter and with no curb to his ambition. To France he went once more, and was fired by the power and glory of Napoleon. Here was a model worthy of emulation. He began to see himself as the Napoleon of South America, the saviour of his people from the "slavery" of Spain. The ferment in Europe gave Bolivar opportunities for contact with military leaders

and for playing the game of international intrigue. But this was not his real bent. He was above all "a man of the sword and the cape." It was not long before he was back home leading armies against the Spanish "tyrants." Hard and inexorable, finding his solace in the amorous adventures to which the loss of his wife had left him prey, Bolívar is no knight of chivalry. His ruthless exterminations, his duplicity and faithlessness, make him a far from pleasant hero. Yet, thanks to the ideal of "liberation," of something bigger than himself which he kept before his eyes, his figure, as depicted by his biographer, has an element of greatness.

Did Bolívar add to human happiness? Did he bring about the freedom which he proclaimed? The answer appears in the working out of the story. He was not capable of building on the ruins he created, and found that freedom could not be imposed by the sword. When victory came, anarchy was often let loose. On one occasion he presents to his ministers a plea to put Spanish America under the protection of Great Britain. "This proposal," writes de Madariaga, "reveals that, subconsciously, he was rebuilding the Spanish Empire in his mind: religion, monarchy, reunion to a European crown—every element had returned except the Spanish name and nation which his whole past had tabooed." A fascinating Epilogue imagines him stepping before the bar of history, reviewing his career and resigning his title of Liberator. "How," he asks, "could I give you a liberty I did not possess? How could I have liberated you? All I did was to tear to tatters with my sword a thrice secular tradition which had interwoven your froward freedom's into a social canvas whereon History had embroidered an Indo-Spanish pattern."

MOSA ANDERSON.

Bolívar. By Salvador de Madariaga. Hollis & Carter. 45s.

JANE AUSTEN ONCE MORE

Jane Austen has been so much written about that another book on her may seem unnecessary. But Mr. Wright, an American University lecturer, a keen and sympathetic student of her work, has wisely avoided generalities, and mainly devoted himself to one aspect—the structure of the novels and their dominant note, irony. Not merely verbal irony, though felicitous examples of that are quoted, but irony shown in the inter-relation of widely differing characters with incompatible outlooks. He defines "dramatic irony" as the reader's awareness of something hidden from a character by wilful blindness, or failure of perception. Emma's confident disregard of her brother-in-law's hint about Mr. Elton and herself, and of George Knightley's about an understanding between Frank Churchill and Jane Fairfax, are instances in point. In such irony disillusionment is a foremost element, not only in Emma's case but in that of Elizabeth Bennet. Elizabeth is blind to Charlotte's mercenary attitude to marriage, though she had had evidence of it earlier than the Collins engagement which und deceives her, while Darcy and Wickham "are virtually perfect agents of disillusionment and thus of the ironic theme."

Mr. Wright shows how Jane Austen at times intervenes, with direct or oblique comment, or the use of some third person as reporter; beginning as a neutral, disinterested observer, she may pass on to express her own views, or, identifying herself with some characters, give an insight into their minds. Instances are given—the summary of Mr. Bennet's married experiences and disposition—the first impressions of the child Fanny Price. Jane must not, however, be identified with her heroines; "the many shifts in viewpoint indicate a completeness and a detachment which none of the characters can possibly share." Her themes, says Mr. Wright, have been too shallowly interpreted. In *Sense and Sensibility* and *Persuasion* we find much besides an opposition between prudence

and love; *Northanger Abbey* is far more than a mere parody, however delicious, of Gothic romance. The chapter on style shows the novelist's various devices for ironic criticism, by "sly understatement" or the employment of words with the reverse of their usual meaning. As a rule, she avoids metaphors, putting them in the mouths of the characters that she, and we, dislike. Though the pattern in each novel is the same, it is impossible, we think, to adhere strictly to the scheme suggested by Mr. Wright, of a hero and villain as pendants to each heroine; Frank Churchill is neither, and Henry Crawford has critics who fancy him in either capacity. Perhaps it was unnecessary to quote in full such well-known estimates of Jane Austen as Charlotte Brontë's and Scott's, or passages from the novels where a reference might have served, or to describe their plots; either the reader is familiar with these or he should turn to the novels themselves to become so. Mr. Wright has steeped himself in the literature of his subject, his bibliography is exhaustive. One might suggest the addition of Naomi Royde-Smith's *Jane Fairfax*, with its imaginative account of her early life.

EMMA GURNEY SALTER.

Jane Austen's Novels: a Study in Structure, by Andrew H. Wright, Chatto & Windus, 16s. 1953.

• • • • •

Some modern poets love to tie up their message in knots and leave the reader to untie them. Theodora Roscoe belongs to an earlier and better school which expresses its meaning in simple language without any verbal tricks. Her latest volume *St. Albans and other Poems* (Alden & Blackwell, Eton, 3s. 6d.), like its predecessors, breathes a love of the sights and sounds, the birds and flowers, of the countryside which is one of her most endearing characteristics. She also possesses a reverence for the past which shines forth in the poems on *Fountains Abbey* and *The Thames from the South Bank*. The deepest note in the book is struck in *The Great Ones*, a little gem of words and feeling. Here are the opening lines:

Some pass along the highway of our lives
Gentle yet strong, eager and unafraid.
Some only give a sign then hurry on,
But others offer us their outstretched hand.

• • • • •

William Godwin and his World, by Rosalie Glynn Grylls, (Odhams Press, 21s.) is a valuable addition to the author's series of volumes on the Godwin-Shelley-Byron period, in other words the closing decades of the eighteenth and the opening phase of the nineteenth century. It covers the Romantic Movement, the French Revolution, the Napoleonic Wars and the Restoration. As in all such epochs of intellectual ferment thinkers and writers, like the politicians, range themselves on the Right or the Left. In the former were men like Burke, Pitt and Lord Eldon, in the latter forerunners of nineteenth and twentieth century democracy. The present volume, lavishly illustrated and delightfully easy to read, is not yet another biography of the author of *Political Justice* and *Caleb Williams* but a collection of studies of certain aspects of a colourful and controversial epoch. It opens with a detailed account of the Treason Trials of 1794, in which the British tradition of justice triumphed over the panic of the Government at a moment when the blood on the scaffold in Paris had hardly had time to dry. Next comes an instructive chapter on the English Jacobins at home and in France, and then a less politically exciting picture of Charles Lamb and his friends. The later portion of the volume is dominated and

illuminated by the sylph-like figure of Shelley. Amid the throng of celebrities Miss Glynn Grylls moves with easy mastery, equally removed from hero-worship or severity. No twentieth century reader can share the enthusiasm for Godwin felt and expressed by Shelley till he discovered his master's failings, but the old sage had his good points and the author treats him with respect. Far more attractive was Mary Woolstonecraft his first wife, whose emotional experiences in England and France lose nothing in the telling. While there is a certain dryness and drabness about Godwin, the author of the *Vindication of the Rights of Women* bubbled with vitality and therefore provides far better material for the biographer. But the brightest star in the literary firmament is Shelley, erratic and unpredictable, a born social and political rebel, with a soaring imagination and a gentle heart. When he is on the stage we have no eyes for the common crowd.

* * * * *

The latest instalment of the captured *Documents on German Foreign Policy* (Series D., Volume V, H.M. Stationery Office, 25s.), covers the period from June 1937 to March 1939, supplementing previous volumes by a survey of Germany's relations with Danzig, South Eastern Europe, the Baltic and Scandinavian states, the Benelux countries, Switzerland, Turkey, the Near East and Latin America. To British readers the most interesting chapters in this enormous volume of nearly a thousand pages will probably be the first, entitled Poland and Danzig, and the last, entitled the Jewish Question. German policy, as expounded to Burckhardt, the League of Nations High Commissioner for Danzig, to Beck, the Polish Foreign Minister, and to others, was based on saving Europe from the Bolsheviks. Knowing nothing of England, past or present, Hitler hoped we should join him in the crusade and was furious because we declined. He complained in 1937 that, though he had taken great pains to win our friendship, he had encountered ill-will time after time. Since England turned a deaf ear he had helped Franco to save Spain—and perhaps Western Europe—from Communism. Poland, not merely anti-Communist but traditionally anti-Russian, was treated as a friend till the hour for her destruction should strike. Danzig, he informed Beck in January 1939, would sooner or later become German, but he promised that there would be no sudden *coup*. That no trouble was to be expected from England Hitler learned from the report of a conversation with Lord Halifax at Geneva in May, 1938, when the British Foreign Minister described Danzig and the Corridor as an absurdity; separating a large province from the Reich had probably been the most foolish provision of the Treaty of Versailles. While Hitler was weaving his schemes for the domination of Europe, he developed his diabolical vendetta against the Jews. The horrors of the gas chambers had to wait till the world was aflame, and during the period covered by this volume the Nazi policy was to drive out the Jews and steal their property. Invited by the Evian Committee to cooperate in the migration of unwanted citizens by facilitating the transfer of Jewish capital, the German Foreign office bluntly refused. After further discussion, in which Göring and Schacht took part, it was decided to allow them to take out a small percentage of their assets, leaving most of it in the hands of their persecutors. One advantage of the policy of spoilation was indicated in a circular of the Foreign Ministry of January 1939. "The poorer the immigrant Jew and thus the greater burden he is to his country of immigration, the more strongly will the host country react and the more desirable will be the effect in the interest of German propaganda." The more we learn of the aims and methods of Nazi policy as set forth in their own official documents, the more we realise to what depths of wickedness the temporary masters of a great nation could sink.



THE OXFORD DICTIONARY OF QUOTATIONS

first published in 1941 has now been reissued in a second, and completely revised edition. When the book first appeared, it was hailed by a host of critics with enthusiasm. For instance, Mr. Raymond Mortimer, in the *New Statesman* called it 'exemplary', and Sir Desmond MacCarthy said that it was a 'great improvement on its predecessors'. If that was true then, it is even truer now.

42s. net

THE REBIRTH OF AUSTRIA by RICHARD HISCOCKS 18s. net

'... his book must become essential reading for anybody who wishes to study and understand the forces fashioning the future of South-eastern Europe ...'

Oxford Mail

SURVEY OF INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS 1939-1946

America, Britain, and Russia : Their Co-operation and Conflict
by WILLIAM HARDY McNEILL 63s. net

Published under the Auspices of the Royal Institute of International Affairs.

THE PRICE OF FUEL by I. M. D. LITTLE 12s. 6d. net

Since the war there have been recurrent coal shortages, causing unemployment and a breakdown of production in 1947, and the import of coal in three subsequent years. This shocking history is not due solely to the failure of the National Coal Board to expand output sufficiently to satisfy an increasing demand. It is also due to the extraordinary inefficiency with which Britain consumes fuel in comparison with other countries. This in turn is the result largely of the misconceived and unco-ordinated pricing policies adopted by the three nationalized fuel industries. A reform of prices and tariffs constitutes the main part of the national fuel policy proposed here, a policy which is urgently needed if crises are to be avoided in the future, and if Britain is ever again to achieve the large coal exports of pre-war years. Such exports are needed far more now than they were then.

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

THE WESTERN POLITICAL QUARTERLY

*A national professional journal
published in March, June, September, December
by the University of Utah.*

Approximately 800 pages per volume.

The Western Political Quarterly, in order to co-operate with countries outside the U.S. dollar area, offers as a special feature subscriptions at the annual rate of \$5.00 payable at the official exchange rate in local (blocked) currency.

Some leading articles of recent date are :

The Premises of Indian Political Thought

D. MACKENZIE BROWN

Richard Hooker and English Conservatism

SHELDON S. WOLIN

The Fate of Neo-Federalism in Western Europe

CLARENCE C. WALTON

Formation and Transformation of Gaullism in France

ROBERT G. NEUMANN

"Les Partis Politiques"

SAMUEL H. BEER

"The China Story"

TANG TSOU

America and the New British Radicalism

GORDON K. LEWIS

Aspects of the Political Struggle in Italy

CLIFFORD A. L. RICH

The Italian Action Party on the Institutional Question

NORMAN KOGAN

Israel: The Development of a Polity

OSCAR KRAINES

The Aprista Search for a Program Applicable to Latin America

HARRY KANTOR

The Fiction of the First Freedom

RICHARD L. SKLAR

The Compromising Roosevelt

R. G. TUGWELL

Send orders to F. B. Schick, Managing Editor

THE WESTERN POLITICAL QUARTERLY

University of Utah
Salt Lake City, Utah, U.S.A.

CURRENT PERIODICAL SERIES

PUBLICATION NO.: 865

TITLE: CONTEMPORARY REVIEW

VOLUME: 185 - 186 ISSUES: 1057 - 1068

DATE: January - December 1954

This publication is reproduced by agreement
with the publisher. Extensive duplication or
resale without permission is prohibited.

University Microfilms, Ann Arbor, Michigan, 1955